THE AMERICAN SCHOLAR

Vol. 9 Autumn · 1940 No. 4

Editorial — *John Erskine*

More Important than Daily Bread — *Erich Kahler*

Uncle Sam—Farmer — *John R. Fleming*

Tenure: Academic Question? — *Horace L. Friess, Ernest J. Simmons, George Boas, Charles W. Flint*

The Background for Hitler in German Thought — *Julius Seelye Bixler*

Miss Emily and the Bibliographer — *Allen Tate*

Confessions of an Unrepentant Wilsonian — *Albert Guérard*

The WPA Writers: Portraitists of the United States — *Katharine Kellock*

Culture Inside Nazi Germany — *Kurt Pinthus*

Published Quarterly for General Circulation by

P H I · B E T A · K A P P A

$2.00 a year 50 cents a copy

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SATISFACTION

and *Pride of Possession* comes in knowing that the QUALITY and the design of your purchase is the BEST that your budget affords. The L. G. Balfour Company makes and sponsors articles in every price field—you are assured that orders placed with your official jeweler protect your insignia and give you maximum value.

The Balfour Guarantee—

1. That Balfour made merchandise is exactly as represented.
2. That it represents the best value for the price paid and thus insures complete satisfaction.
3. That your money will be refunded should merchandise fail to meet full specifications and your satisfaction

★

WRITE TODAY FOR YOUR COPY OF
THE BALFOUR BLUE BOOK
FREE
Mailed postpaid—Mention Your Fraternity

★

Buy with complete confidence from
SOLE OFFICIAL JEWELER TO
Phi Beta Kappa

L. G. BALFOUR COMPANY

ATTLEBORO, MASSACHUSETTS

. . . . *In Canada visit your nearest BIRK'S Store* . . . .

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AUTUMN · 1940 VOLUME 9 · No. 4

THE AMERICAN SCHOLAR

PHI · BETA · KAPPA

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The American Scholar

Autumn · 1940 Vol. 9 · No. 4

Contents

Editorial	John Erskine	387
More Important than Daily Bread	Erich Kahler	389
Uncle Sam—Farmer	John R. Fleming	402
Tenure: Academic Question? A Symposium		417
Diverse Attitudes and Practices	Horace L. Friess	420
A Young Man's Problem	Ernest J. Simmons	424
The Professor's Obligations and Immunities	George Boas	429
Flexible Administration or Inflexible Regulation	Charles W. Flint	433
The Background for Hitler in German Thought	Julius Seelye Bixler	437
Miss Emily and the Bibliographer	Allen Tate	449
Confessions of an Unrepentant Wilsonian	Albert Guérard	461
The WPA Writers: Portraitists of the United States	Katharine Kellock	473
Culture Inside Nazi Germany	Kurt Pinthus	483
In the Workshop		
Twentieth Century Mathematics	Marston Morse	499
Discussion		
On Cultural Contact	Robert W. Bretall	505
Mr. Kohn Refutes a Point	Hans Kohn	506
A Letter to Mr. Kohn	Rushton Coulborn	506
"The AMA is not a Policeman"	Frank A. Marshall, M.D.	507
—But "It Does Set Itself Up As One"	T. Swann Harding	508
About Our Authors		
	Compiled by Ruth E. Campbell	509
Index		511

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE EDITORIAL BOARD

John Bakeless
Crane Brinton
Harry Woodburn Chase
Irwin Edman
John Erskine
Christian Gauss
Will David Howe
Alvin Johnson
Burton E. Livingston
William Allan Neilson
Mary K. Simkhovitch
Irita Van Doren

William Allison Shimer, *Editor*

Ruth E. Campbell, *Associate Editor*
Beryl Williams, *Assistant Editor*

Marjorie Hope Nicolson, *Consulting Editor*

Editorial

Do You Call It Isolation?

JOHN ERSKINE

To discuss the isolation of the United States is to reveal how little we understand our country. Europe may be isolated from us, but we cannot be isolated from Europe. We come from all parts of the old world; this is the only place on earth where Europeans at this moment are living together in peace. One of my neighbors is French, one is Irish, two are English, one is Italian, one German, one a Jew. Here they can be friends. If they had stayed on the other side of the water they couldn't be.

This is the essence of American democracy. We deserve for it neither blame nor credit. It is imposed by the circumstances of history. This country, since the Revolution, has been an experiment to decide whether men of different races can live together as one nation, united by a civilized idea. The experiment has not yet had entire success. We have not yet treated all races alike. We cannot even pretend to have done so, in the presence of the Indian, the Negro and the Jew. But our progress, in spite of tragic failures, gives meaning to our democracy. Without it we should be simply an extension or suburb of Europe.

The leaders of the Revolution foresaw that the break with the mother country would produce this peculiarity in the colonies, and that the mother country would be slow to recognize America as an island of peace for war-torn Europeans. It was not to be expected that Great Britain, even after the separation, would easily think of us as

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

other than an Anglo-Saxon country, no matter how many Irish, or Germans, Slavs, Scandinavians or Latins migrated here. Now that the scars of the Revolution have faded, and at a moment when the majority of us sympathize deeply with Great Britain, it is not to be expected that Englishmen, with their backs to the wall, or even their friends among us, will scrupulously respect the condition on which our democracy depends. We can live together, a mixture of European peoples, so long as we forget our racial past and join in a common future, an American future. If sympathy for any ancestral home induces the descendants of that land to involve the United States in European quarrels, some other group among us will reply in kind, the quarrel will be brought over here and the structure of our democracy will crack.

Though I am of British descent, and fervently hope Naziism will get what I believe it deserves, I am a child of people who knew why they came here, who never ceased to be glad they came. I believe that our cosmopolitan democracy, different from all other democracies because it is so cosmopolitan, is vital to civilization and should be preserved. As a citizen I treasure certain prophetic words of Washington's, and as a scholar I treasure Emerson's famous address, the title of which names this magazine. Our land would prosper, Washington said, "If our citizens would advocate their own cause, instead of that of any other nation under the sun; that is, if, instead of being Frenchmen or Englishmen in politics they would be Americans, indignant at every attempt of either or any other powers to establish an influence in our councils or presume to sow the seeds of discord or disunion among us."

"Our day of dependence," said Emerson, "our long apprenticeship to the learning of other lands, draws to a close." Few men knew or loved the past better than he, but our destiny, as he reminded us, is in the future. The answer to the riddle is in our souls.

As I read the current issue of THE AMERICAN SCHOLAR I found myself thinking: Why waste time explaining Hitlerism or expressing personal indignation? Hitler is a force, not to be inconvenienced by critical essays. It is an intellectual and moral force—call it immoral, if you prefer; it can be checked by arms, but it can be overcome only by a superior intellectual or moral force. That superior force I believe is American democracy of the cosmopolitan kind. No country in Europe can preserve this kind of democracy for us. We must preserve it ourselves. The American scholar might use more of Emerson's advice, turn his eyes homeward to his own faith, and explain it to the world.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

More Important than Daily Bread

ERICH KAHLER

WE STAND in the midst of a tremendous crisis in human development, the greatest perhaps since the advent of Christianity. This crisis manifests itself in an increasing anarchy in international relations, an unhinging of the world economy, a shattering of moral values that have prevailed for centuries and a profound confusion of the human spirit. At present every outlook is overshadowed by a huge system of aggression which, after having overwhelmed the European continent, threatens the freedom of this hemisphere. What is the nature of this system of aggression, how did it originate, whence did it stem?

Some people believe it to be the outcome of a new trend in ideas and methods, more effective and more adequate to the realities of our times than the old principles and attitudes of humanitarian democracy. To others it represents merely a new fit of the old lust for power, another imperialistic conquest like the Napoleonic, but one more ruthless, more skillful, more completely mechanized.

There is a certain amount of truth in both of these opinions, but only a partial, a very superficial truth. To be fully prepared against the imminent menace we cannot content ourselves with these explanations, for they grapple with symptoms instead of with the real, deep-seated evil. It is indispensable to realize that we are facing today not merely a shift in ideas which we could combat with other ideas, or an attack impelled by mere human greed which calls for counter-weapons no more powerful than gigantic armaments. We must be aware of the real issue, and this lies beneath the surface of our daily turmoil.

The two world revolutions, communist and fascist (which were contrived by human beings), and all the other struggles

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and disorders of today have their roots in another and far more radical world revolution, one caused not by man but by man's inventions—*the technical world revolution.*

The process of technical development created, unobserved, an indissoluble interdependence of all parts of the world, all of life's activities, all individuals and all nations. Yet peoples and individuals still behave as though they were just as independent and just as much their own masters as in ancient times; they think and act in patterns no longer adequate to the actual circumstances. Physical objects and objective processes have acquired an unheeded power over human beings and have set up among men something they can no longer grasp. But human beings have for ages personified the cause of their woes, and they continue to do so. It is therefore easy for ambitious demagogues to incite them against all sorts of puppet-enemies—against labor, capital, Jews, aliens, bad government, plutocratic countries. And so men destroy one another and their common world instead of joining in a common effort to make man finally the master of these masterless objective processes.

The interrelationship of mankind today has a threefold action: *economic and political*, *social* and *moral.* It has three dimensions: internationally it spans the earth; nationally it penetrates every stratum of the population; spiritually it ties all the provinces of human activity together with a new and rigid bond. Paradoxically enough, the first and unmistakable sign whereby it reveals itself is anarchy, the incapacity of the human will to meet the demands of this excessive integration.

The new phenomenon, which grew out of the industrial revolution and the technical inventions of the 19th and 20th centuries, first made itself felt internationally as economic interdependence. At the beginning of the industrial era countries were still able themselves to supply their far smaller populations with the essential commodities. Agriculture, crafts and trade dominated their economies. But the growth of industry dislocated this economy. Many raw materials could only be procured abroad and many home industries manufactured goods

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that were in part produced in other countries. Meanwhile populations everywhere grew so tremendously that domestic agriculture could no longer supply their needs. The use of industrial products tended to make peoples similar and created an international standard of living that all countries aspired to reach and maintain. In the great economic crises of 1857 and 1873 this interdependence of peoples became clear for the first time. Though they were confined to the economic field they were both world crises. They revealed the extent to which the new situation had grown beyond human control, the discrepancy between a claim to unlimited freedom of action for individuals and for nations, and the subterranean interweaving of their destinies.

Nevertheless the period was the apogee of free competition; there was still enough free space in the world for national economies and industrial enterprises to exploit, so that in general their free competition could remain a peaceably regulated contest and not degenerate into a struggle for reciprocal destruction. So over-production and over-speculation, the most important causes of crises in the world economy, could pass as mere errors in tempo and individual calculation; and the crises themselves, though they took a heavy toll, passed off. But they announced the dangerous condition toward which humanity was steering; and the great stock market panics of the 19th century were heralds of today's general world panic.

Although the steam engine and the telegraph were important steps in the development of communications, the growing exploitation of electric power and the invention of the motor and of wireless communication were the decisive influences in weaving people and peoples together. But meanwhile (and even more important) the general spirit of progress, under the spur of industrial expansion, created an economy of perpetual invention. This economy has for a long time been functioning independently, under the very questionable assumption that invention is invariably conducive to the welfare of humanity.

This economy, a new system of life, has for more than half

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a century been in the process of mechanizing every article we touch; and in doing so it has taken the control out of the hands of the individual person and the individual nation, and has gradually built up the gigantic technical apparatus that surrounds human life today—an apparatus upon which people have become more dependent than they know and through which (without their full consciousness) they have become more and more dependent upon one another.

The fundamental change in life had proceeded unnoted from the end of the 19th century. Another crisis was needed to reveal it; and because the fundamental change was so widespread the new crisis was world-shaking. From 1870 on there had been no struggle for existence among the great powers. The wars of the period up to 1914 were peripheral struggles for spheres of influence, colonies and markets. The civilian world had grown so accustomed to peace that a serious war seemed to it like a romantic adventure possible only in savage times or in savage places. But beneath the surface of this peace the gravest conflicts had long been gathering: colonies and markets had been divided up and the American and the European frontier had been closed. And into this closed system of world economy a belated Germany forced its way with a violent claim to "a place in the sun."

When the World War really broke out people felt at first, by analogy to earlier wars they had read of, that it was a traditional struggle for power. It began as a political war between two groups of powers; both supposed the war could be concluded as of old, by a military decision. And, great as the conflict was, until the Battle of the Marne it still seemed to be a normal war based on national alliances. But it thereafter developed into something new, an elemental catastrophe no human power could check. It acquired a scope theretofore unknown and revealed the enormous political consequences of the economic interweaving of the peoples of the world.

Beyond that it began to involve every sphere of social and human life, to recast the whole of human civilization. It re-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vealed, in addition to the international, politico-economic interrelation of events and of peoples throughout the world, a still more important interrelation within nations—an entirely new kind of intersocial relationship within the state.

But the extent to which human beings had become mechanized and the masses interlocked did not appear until the tremendous apparatus of destruction built up by the armies of modern civilization had been set in motion. And thanks to the system of perpetual invention standing ready in the factories and scientific institutions behind the front, the technics of war materials and of warfare were developed more rapidly than in any other war. The permanent trenches, closed fronts, were the basis of a new kind of warfare. On this foundation there developed in every region simultaneously, and far back into the hinterland, the gigantic modern battle for which the Germans found the characteristic name "*Materialschlacht*"—a battle of *matériel.* In it men are chained to machines in a precisely geared, collective operation of which no man can see the whole, from which there is no escape and in which men are no more than *matériel.* Machines outweighed the masses of men and the masses of men outweighed the individual, who was thrust, in this hellish cooperation, into an abyss of isolation.

This modern battle of *matériel* is a living symbol of the social process evolved by the entire body politic during the war, and more especially after the war. For the first time war caught up an entire people. Of their civil life and their civilization scarcely anything remained. In Germany's organization of her supply of raw materials, which was the work of Walther Rathenau, later Minister of Foreign Affairs, lies the origin of all our present-day planned economy. In 1930 Ernst Jünger wrote:

> So the picture of war as a military action merges more and more into the wider picture of a gigantic industrial procedure. Beside the armies that meet on the battlefield arise the new armies engaged in communications, foodstuffs, armaments—the army of industry as a whole. In the last phase there is not a motion, not even that of a woman working at home at her sewing machine, in which, at least indirectly, a military

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

application does not inhere. . . . The ultimate possibilities . . . are meantime only to be achieved if the picture of the military procedure has already been sketched out in the peacetime organization. So we see how in many nations of the post-War period the new methods of armament are made to order for total mobilization. Phenomena such as the radical destruction of individual freedom in Russia and Italy, where the goal is the creation of a society in which nothing can exist that cannot be understood as a function of the state, may be cited here. So, too, may the originally French concept of *énergie potentielle* and the cooperation, already begun in peacetime, between the American general staff and industry. . . . Simply to look at our daily life in its roaring activity and its merciless discipline, its districts of smoking and glowing furnaces, the physics and metaphysics of its traffic, its motors, its airplanes and its cities with their millions of inhabitants, is to sense with a horror mingled with pleasure that in it there is not one atom that is not at work, and that we ourselves are committed to the core to this raging process. Total mobilization is far less effected than it effects itself: in war and peace it is the expression of the secret, mysterious and compulsive demand to which this life in an age of masses and machines makes us subject.[1]

This makes it clear how "total war" gave rise to "total mobilization" and "total mobilization" to the "total state."

Jünger belongs to that now very powerful group who conceive the new technical interrelationship among men as a military achievement only. In war, in the battle of *matériel*, their vision was born; war constitutes for them the unalterable basic law of the world. For them the unprecedented coupling of mechanical and human powers achieved by the totalitarian state has for its sole purpose the forward thrust of collective imperialism. Their goal is basically no goal at all; it is the process, the "dynamics" of the conquest itself; it is the setting of a record in a horrible competitive sport that has the world for a field and whole peoples for a stake. They make "worker" synonymous with "warrior"; and, intoxicated by modern technics, find their final confirmation and justification in a hitherto nonexistent power to deal an enemy a blow.

But what becomes of the human being, as centuries of the

[1] *Die totale Mobilmachung*, Berlin, 1930.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

classical and the Christian tradition have formed him—the human being for whose richer and more fraternal life all technical inventions were originally conceived? Well, the human being has disappeared from this picture, engulfed as he was engulfed in the battle of *matériel*. And yet out of the gulf another movement, one which likewise originated in the World War, has broken forth, a counter-movement representing a different aspect of the contemporary world, or rather an aspect of the world of the future.

In the contending armies of both sides during the World War a common, almost brotherly mood gradually came into being. It was a silent, embittered conspiracy of men in whom identical experiences of almost unbearable gravity had melted away all the superficial layers of nationality, class, individuality, and laid bare the ultimate truth of man's sheer being. It was a mutual rebellion of these men against the gabble of politicians and the phrases of chauvinism. It was a realization of the futility and madness of all struggle for power when set over against the reality of the mechanical extermination which that war had become. It was such a penetrating feeling of human solidarity as had never before taken hold of mankind. And on both fronts a resolve took form: that this must not happen again, that a new and better order was at stake, that the peoples themselves must take their fate in their own hands and together establish their common rights through a supra-national constitution.

The young German painter, Franz Marc, who was killed in action in 1916 wrote at the beginning of 1915:

> We in the field of battle feel most deeply that these gruesome months will not mean a mere shifting of political powers, but that the blood that has been shed will represent an offering made in a profound communion of all peoples for the sake of a common goal. . . . Boundaries shall not be set anew but broken down. . . . Let us remain soldiers even after the war . . . for this is not a war . . . against an external enemy, as the newspapers and our honored politicians say, nor . . . of one race against another; it is a European civil war, a war against the inner invisible enemy of the European spirit. . . .

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

And that is what that war has now actually become—a worldwide civil war in which the struggles between nations, classes, races and doctrines are the mere ephemeral, external manifestations of a struggle for a new order on earth.

The Great War was only a prelude; the actual crisis did not come until later. Of the leading statesmen of that period only one was alive to the realization that had united the soldiers of both factions at the front—President Wilson. His plan for a peace in which there was to be no victor and no vanquished was the outcome of their profound experience. But Wilson's peace plan was vitiated and consequently the entire ensuing period was dominated by a "realistic policy"—in other words a policy of the narrowest, most apprehensive self-preservation for each country, no matter how small—in a time when only the resolute cooperation of all could have brought salvation; a policy of inaction or of yielding at the last minute when things had come close to ruin and it was therefore too late—at a time when events gather at long range in a frame as wide as the world; a "realistic policy," that is to say professional politics, in a period when matters of moment have long taken place not in the realm of politics but at the very heart of civilization.

The fateful consequences are well enough known. The crisis moved over into the field of economics. The war had not only unhinged the system of world economy which had developed naturally; it had caused a general decrease in population and buying power, with a simultaneous increase in industrialization the world over. Bitter need arose in the midst of plenty, was caused by plenty. Not only those who possessed nothing but those who had nothing more to gain, suffered; for under the postulate of a free economy, wealth cannot be kept unless it is increased. Among the nations the rich, barred up with their riches, were set apart from the poor, the belated and the frustrated who proposed to get their due by force. Anarchy spread, and from that time on the powers holding the advantage were not those which fed their own selfishness in passive isolation but those which actively and aggressively organized it. The

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

triumphal march toward "total mobilization" and the "total state" began. In the mechanized wilderness into which international society had degenerated, dictatorship evolved its accurate machinery of conquest.

The society produced by post-War conditions revealed a third form of that new human interrelationship which is a distinctive feature of our era: the indissoluble moral and psychic connection between the various spheres of human activity. Everything that takes place today, whatever the field of public or even private life, inexorably affects the very foundations of human existence and calls for a fundamental moral decision on the part of humanity. We can no longer engage in politics, economics or science as if each were a separate province but must realize that our dealings in each will be felt in every other sphere, will affect the innermost structure of human society.

This was true even before the totalitarian state became a reality. But the totalitarian governments were the first to realize it and to act upon the realization. While they were subjecting every field of human activity to their despotic political aims they extended their technical machinery of conquest into the human soul itself. The fearful word *Gleichshaltung*, borrowed from electrical terminology, expresses this plainly. Outwardly these states seem to have politicized all of life; actually they have overstepped the bounds of mere politics and have initiated a revolutionary change in our whole civilization. Yet even today people in the non-totalitarian countries are fatefully unaware of the organic inseparability of different fields of activity from each other or the whole of the body politic.

The totalitarian states point with pride to the all-embracing nature of their military, governmental, industrial and spiritual machinery. Everything has been consumed in this machinery, even the principles it works with. And these principles—like anti-communism and anti-fascism—are interchanged without a qualm when the one and only fixed principle, the expansion of power, demands it. The final outcome has been the radical anti-humanism and anti-Christianity of these régimes.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The last war taught them that a people can be kept in a constant and dynamic state of hostility toward other peoples and races and to what degree a people in such a paroxysmal state of mind can be ruled. They learned above all that the brutal and sadistic impulses of human beings attain unexpected effectiveness when the last traces of moral obligation that might possibly check them are eradicated. Machiavelli is generally regarded as having fathered the modern dictatorship. Yet this is true only in part. Machiavelli authorized princes to use crime to further their own power. But in his day and even long afterward politics were the concern of the few, of rulers and their ministers, who fought out their quarrels and intrigues with the help of mercenaries and of a few bankers and agents. The people as a whole had very little knowledge of what was going on; they had a great deal to suffer from it but very little to do with it. On the sporadic occasions when the populace took part in some civic upheaval in a town of the Renaissance a bit of demagogic juggling with concepts that in no way contradicted the age-old principles of Christian civilization sufficed the needs of power politics. And although politics, despite Christianity and international law, have always been a kind of moral no man's land, governments have nevertheless up to the present tried in some way or other to reconcile the amorality of international politics with the norms of the Decalogue and the Sermon on the Mount prevailing within nations; the hypocrisy they were forced to use reveals their acceptance of these norms.

But today all peoples, self-governing or not, are actively-participating instruments of politics. Even the dictator-states cannot manage without their support and must introduce the amorality of international politics into the sphere of the domestic norms; for the humane impulses of generosity and of help for the weak, the doubts and criticism of a moral and intellectual conscience, become monkey-wrenches in the state machinery. So it is not Machiavelli's precepts but the new spirit of technics, in infamous alliance with the old Machiavellian struggle for power, which threatens the bases of our civilization.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

For the theoreticians of the total state the highest value of technics lies in their contribution of a weapon of hitherto unheard-of striking power. This emphasis is just as much a contradiction of the original and still-basic meaning of technics as the moral anarchy created by the totalitarian states is an anachronism in our civilization. And the two go hand in hand.

The dream of a united, ever-better and happier humanity stood godfather to the technical revolution. It was the spirit of a secularized Christianity flowing out into the world at large. Innately technics have not belied their spiritual heritage; it is human beings who have belied it, human beings who have stuck fast in their atavistic desires and modes of thinking while their physical environment has consistently gone on developing along the lines of the original humane promise held out by the technical revolution. The chaos of today is a battle between the technical revolution and human beings—who are ready enough to accept technics, but stripped of their true meaning and welded instead to man's own inveterate selfishness. Automobiles and airplanes, the telegraph, telephone, cinema and radio have made the world a unit. The inherent function of these inventions is obvious: to bring men closer to one another, to let them take a direct part in the fates of other people and peoples—to reach a common decision on matters of common concern. Yet men have made of technics a means to betray the people.

The objects we use are delivered to us without our knowing where or how they are made. Everything, from buses to beer cans, is addressed to an unlimited anonymous crowd. Thousands of gadgets are devised and produced for daily use, and these gadgets, mechanically manufactured and standardized, are intended and offered for mass use. Under the conditions of production prevailing today even the rich man can no longer procure the most essential goods unless the poorer can command them too. Need in the midst of plenty is no longer bearable because in consequence of our economic interdependence plenty itself turns into need. Yet people still act as though in this gigantic collective process of interaction, the current of our

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

daily life, they could insist upon their old individual independence, their unconditional economic and national sovereignty —as though they could rise at the expense of others who fall.

Our modern technical apparatus is increasingly being converted into a world-wide system, unifying all of man's activities; today it operates wildly because it lacks human control; only through a united effort to act in accordance with the essential unity of the system will mankind be able to master it and its thousandfold process. And the revolt of individuals and peoples against this unity leads to the enslavement and devastation we are experiencing today—enslavement and devastation not only of the conquered but of the conqueror.

This and this alone is the issue. All other struggles and disorders, watchwords and slogans, falsify and becloud it. Diplomatic and military encounters between nations have long since ceased to mean what they once did; they have become secondary expedients and episodes in that far more general struggle that is engulfing all peoples, a struggle in which the boundaries between foreign and domestic politics are growing more and more indistinct. We are experiencing what is no longer an external conflict between nations but an internal civil war of humanity: a war between the forces of anarchic self-interest, greed and the will to power; and the forces of human solidarity, unity and fraternity, an international and Christian order of world-citizenship. It is just as much a purely practical struggle to attain mastery over the technical system as it is a moral struggle to preserve the foundations of our civilization. They are today one and the same.

The duty of man toward his brother and toward the destiny of humankind has always been proclaimed by the world religions and the great thinkers. But until now the struggle has always been a purely moral one, conducted at the periphery of human cultures; its vicissitudes could influence but not altogether jeopardize the life of peoples. Today for the first time, as a consequence of our new technical interdependence, this battle sets at stake the very existence of the whole of human

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

society—not only its ideal but its material continuance. Today for the first time moral duty is a practical necessity; for nations and individuals, self-interest jeopardizes not only the interests of others but their own. Today for the first time Christianity is the only true "realistic policy."

So in the present civil war there stand on the one side the powers for whom the ancient and priceless value of the human being no longer exists, who want to degrade man to an instrument among other instruments, who regard technics merely as a perfected engine of destruction. And whether they call themselves fascist or communist is quite indifferent.

It is not, however, the ruthless individualists, the adherents of the old, free competition, of self-isolation and unlimited national, economic and social sovereignty who stand, as they suppose, on the other side; for they by their attitude have prepared the ground (and continue to do so) for the totalitarian state and the mechanized anarchy prevailing all over the world.

On the other side stand only those who set over against the solidarity of the "total state" a higher and wider solidarity, the concrete solidarity of the human community, of that which we shall call *total humanity*—those who know that because our modern world is founded on industrialism it inexorably demands this total humanity. One can only fight the "total state," or escape it, by substituting for it a duty to total humanity.

The concepts of humaneness and justice, the counsel of a new humanism, are certainly the very last things to move the present world to a fundamental change. The feeling for the right and the good has been assiduously suppressed in human beings; and many in whom it is still alive are making every effort to suppress it because ill teaching and ill fortune have made them believe the right is not the right thing. The sense of the beauty of goodness cannot be given to people; it has to grow in them. But we can expect the good to well up in them naturally when the course of events forces them to see that without human community and fraternity they are all lost together; that man needs goodness as he needs his daily bread.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Uncle Sam—Farmer

JOHN R. FLEMING

BY ACCIDENT or design our geographically-minded forefathers wrote a Constitution which gave to farmers a strategic advantage open to no other single economic group. Because geography rather than population is the basis for representation in the Senate, those who live on the land have always been in the best position, at least in theory, to write their own legislative ticket. And yet agriculture, with a quarter of the population and nearly a third of all the children of the nation, collects little more than a tenth of the national income and to this extent has been subsidizing business and industry in this country. It is astonishing that farmers have made so little use of their potential political power in their own interest. They seem to have used it least when most of the population lived on farms. Only after most of the population had left the farms and after industrialization and urbanization crowded agriculture into an economic corner did the farmers begin to use their legislative power more often and for purposes more plainly agrarian. Even so it would be hard to find an instance in which they have used it unfairly.

To call the Department of Agriculture the farmer's department is only part of the truth, for it spends millions in the service of both farmers and consumers. It seems truer, if less tangible, to call it the department which relates agriculture, governmentally, to the rest of the economy. Its crop and livestock reports provide impartial, accurate estimates, at frequent intervals, of food and feed supplies; daily, almost hourly, its market news reports keep producers and consumers aware of supplies on the market and prices bid and asked; its economic analyses, spread by press, by radio and by countless farmers' meetings throughout the land, untangle the price-making mech-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

anism of our economy and offer a basis for understanding and adjustment to change. The Department helps farmers fight disease in plants and animals and wages unremitting warfare on insects of man, beast and plant. It manages the 180,000,000 acres in the National Forests; fights forest fires there and dust explosions in grain elevators. It supervises all the commodity futures markets (the Chicago Board of Trade, the New York Cotton Exchange, etc.) to fix limits on speculative transactions, prevent chicanery, in general establish the rules of the game; it has what amounts to cooperative agreements with nearly six of the seven million farmers of the United States to enable them to battle soil erosion and soil depletion, to adjust supply to probable demand, and to lift, a little, inadequate farm incomes and living standards. To hundreds of thousands of farm families at the bottom of the heap, denied both cash and credit, the Department makes loans for a mule or a plow or a pressure-cooker, helps the borrower rearrange his farm and household operations for the better—and gets back more than 80 per cent of its money. It helps the little farmer organize little cooperatives for everything from the purchase of a purebred bull to the payment of doctors' bills. Big cooperatives for marketing farm products (cooperatives which did a gross business of $1,750,000,000 in 1939) receive financial and technical help from the Farm Credit Administration, lately made a part of the Department; and seven hundred local cooperatives, born since 1933 (with the Rural Electrification Administration as midwife) are making it possible to distribute electrical energy to 350,000 farm families.

And: the Department channels surplus food to the hungry through a food stamp plan and puts millions of quarts of milk into the stomachs of malnourished school children; it maintains an ever-normal granary of wheat and corn and cotton to keep prices and supplies from taking swift plunges up and down, to the delight of the speculator and the ruin of an economy based on the steady exchange of goods and services; it offers crop insurance to wheat farmers and may soon offer it to others; it

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

devises and administers marketing agreements whereby dairymen, truckgrowers and fruitgrowers may even out the flow of their product to market and by giving sellers an even break in a chronic buyers' market keeps competition from becoming too destructive.

Research is fundamental to all the Department does. The organic act establishing the Department in 1862 authorized it "to acquire and to diffuse amongst the people of the United States useful information on subjects connected with agriculture in the most general and comprehensive sense of that word. . . ." The words of the act acquired meaning slowly. It took a long time to disprove the forecast of a Senator who in opposing the establishment of the Department in 1862 doubted that one farmer in a hundred would ever think about the institution, let alone profit by it. He was refuted and the organic act of 1862 was first given significance by scientific research.

The battle against bovine tuberculosis and tick fever, the Department was able to report in 1939, is now virtually won. Out of research on the tick fever of cattle, begun half a century ago, were evolved practical control measures so successful that the fever is now limited to small areas in southern Florida and southwestern Texas, or to less than one per cent of the area once infested. The campaign against bovine tuberculosis became an organized battle, led by the Department, in 1917. It was a battle not only against a disease destructive to human beings as well as to cattle but a struggle against ignorance and fear and substantial economic loss. By 1939 it had been won, the tuberculin test had been applied to every herd of cattle in the United States at least once, 3,750,000 diseased animals had been put out of the way and every agricultural county in the United States had been certified as a "modified accredited area"—that is as an area in which at least 99½ per cent of the cattle are known to be free of the disease.

For years the Department has been worried because two out

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of every three heifer calves raised on American farms are not worth raising. That waste will not be stopped, 21 years of research have convinced the Department, until dairymen use only proved sires—sires, that is, known to transmit high milk and fat production ability uniformly to their daughters. Thousands of farmers in local dairy herd improvement associations, therefore, are now providing the Department with the necessary data on hundreds of thousands of dairy animals. Ultimately American dairy farmers will have access to a master index of superior germ plasm. Meanwhile another group of dairy researchers in 1939 obtained public patents on a process for making wool (or fibers having many of the characteristics of wool) out of milk (specifically, acid casein). They also discovered new ways of converting whey into forms useful to bakers, confectioners and makers of canned soups, and ways of canning Swiss and cheddar cheese in blocks the size and shape of a loaf of bread, and like bread already sliced for sandwiches.

Plant science and statistics are the oldest organized pursuits in the Department. Both began with a Congressional appropriation of $1,000 in 1839 to authorize Henry L. Ellsworth, a Commissioner of Patents with an interest in agriculture, to collect foreign seeds and plants and badly-needed statistics about crop and livestock production.

A century later, in 1939, the plant scientists could report such things as these: that hybrid seed corn, outyielding ordinary varieties by 20 per cent or better, had spread from half a million acres in 1935 to 17 million in 1938; that farmers may now plant wheats resistant to rust and to smut, varieties of winter oats hardy enough for Tennessee, oats resistant to smut in Kansas, Trebi barley capable of outyielding any other barley now grown in North America, and early grain sorghums which have already extended the sorghum region 400 miles northward; that scala cotton, introduced by the Department from Mexico 30 years ago, is now the outstanding variety of upland cotton in the irrigated regions; and that as a result of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

inbreeding and crossing, strains of hemp free from marihuana seem in prospect.

The plant scientists report that in the Dust Bowl they have succeeded in breeding buffalo grass, which produces a heavy crop of seed and at the same time grows so high off the ground that an ordinary mower can harvest it, thus speeding up enormously the return of native grass to the dry plains. After 30 years of work in the northern Great Plains the researchers now know exactly how much moisture the soil must hold at seeding-time for a given yield of spring wheat. They have found that 9-inch plowing in the Columbia Basin increases wheat yields from two to five bushels an acre over the customary 5-inch plowing; that in California a species of Ephedra, the source of alkaloid ephedrine, can be grown under irrigation; and that in Virginia the dill-herb can probably be grown to produce dill-herb oil, useful in pickling. The 1939 list of new varieties of plants, superior in specific ways to those currently used, includes not only wheat and corn, oats and barley, but also peaches, plums, strawberries, almonds, lettuce, tomatoes, potatoes, pumpkins and papayas. Grasses and legumes from various parts of the world give promise of resisting drought and tying down the soil where erosion is a problem. For some of the new plant varieties, public patents are pending among the 244 applications for letters patent prosecuted in the Patent Office during the fiscal year 1939 on behalf of scientists in the Department of Agriculture.

Specific, practical results of research are usually achieved only after scientists have discovered certain fundamentals. We have wheat resistant to rust, sugar cane resistant to mosaic disease, only because the Department's plant breeder some years ago demonstrated that resistance to disease in plants is a genetic character which can be bred into or out of a given strain. A more recent discovery, of the kind that excites scientists but leaves Congressional appropriations committees indifferent, is the revelation that it is the gradual change in the length of day, rather than the approach of autumn or the passage of time,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which causes a plant to bloom or to form fruit. It has taken 20 years of patient research to demonstrate this adequately and to begin the practical applications—not only to the greenhouse producing flowers for market but far more importantly to the broad field of plant genetics. The potential value of this knowledge in increasing crop yields, and generally in controlling the environment of plants for whatever purposes may be desired, is incalculable.

The plant hunters, whose centennial as a government-sponsored group was noted in 1939, together with the geneticists have given us our present agricultural map. Our wheat belt, our cotton belt, our fruit belt and all the other "belts" are theirs to an astonishing degree. Not one person in a thousand, I am sure, realizes that most of the plants we live on, directly or indirectly, at some time in the past had to be transplanted from foreign lands and adapted to an American environment. The plant hunters brought to the United States the wheats from which were developed our present hard, winter and durum wheats and the disease-resisting varieties; oats and barleys, sorghums, rice and flax; disease- and cold-resistant potatoes, melons, lettuce, onions, carrots, tomatoes, sweet-potatoes; such forage plants as crested wheat grass, alfalfa, lespedeza and soybeans; new varieties of cotton and tobacco for improvement of the domestic ones; deciduous and subtropical fruits, including apples, peaches, grapes, citrus fruits, avocados, dates; and sugar cane and sugar beets. In fact of the 78 principal field, fruit, nut and truck crops of the United States only 10 are native to this country.

What the plant scientists do, however, insects and diseases can almost undo. The Department's entomologists are therefore incessantly at work. They reported, in 1939, that the hickory shuckworm of the pecan has a two-year life cycle and breeds in phylloxera galls; that the blowfly larvae, mysteriously effective in healing obstinate wounds, secretes enzyme urease which acts on the secretions of both larvae and host to form helpful ammonias; that there is now a good dip or wash for

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dogs found carrying the dangerous Rocky Mountain ticks; that insect parasites introduced from the Department's special stations at St. Cloud, France and Yokohama, Japan may before long catch up with the Japanese beetle.

The by-products of research like this are sometimes many times greater in value than the immediate discovery. Back in the nineties four Department scientists were groping for an understanding of the habits of the destructive cattle tick. The object was to control the cattle tick and save the livestock industry from heavy losses caused by splenetic fever. Along the way, however, these scientists found that microbial diseases can be carried by an insect host—a discovery which later enabled scientists to trace the role of the mosquito in yellow fever and malaria and of other insects in typhus and sleeping sickness. Similarly inoculation for typhoid grew out of the discovery, made by scientists of the Department, that animals may be immunized by injections of dead bacteria. Whatever the result of the scientific research conducted by the Department of Agriculture, and however strange much of the research may seem to an industrialized, urbanized people, it is usually intensely practical in character and has been undertaken because farmers have a problem they cannot solve and because the great industrial laboratories see no profit in its solution.

A Congressional committee is not always to be wondered at if it fails to grasp the significance of these scientific projects. They run into the hundreds and hundreds, they are complex and mystifying to the layman, and scientific workers are rarely persuasive salesmen of their wares. The material I have cited on the scientific work of the Department does not attempt to cover the output for 1939. It attempts no more than to illustrate the kind of scientific work done and the significance of some of it. I have had to pass over without mention the achievements of the soil scientists, of the great legion of chemists and bacteriologists, the agricultural engineers and the meteorologists, and finally the economists, the statisticians and the sociologists.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Department's collection of statistics has become as basic to its services in the social sciences as its collection of plants has become to its services in the biological sciences. Out of a modest beginning has developed what foreign observers consider the most extensive and most accurate crop and livestock reporting service in the world. The needs of the Civil War and the ingenuity of Isaac Newton, the first Commissioner of Agriculture, created the service. Newton was a Pennsylvania farmer who delivered butter and eggs to the White House but who was prevailed upon to linger, after a while, for the savor and wisdom of his conversation. Made Commissioner of Agriculture by Lincoln in 1862, Newton, upon the establishment of the Department, was faced with the immediate task of combating speculation in food prices and of encouraging adequate food production for the army and he sought some way to estimate the true extent of the food supply and to keep tabs on the progress of crops. If enough good farmers, Newton thought, could be induced to observe the condition of crops in their communities and report their observations to Washington regularly, the government would have a tolerably good check on prospective supplies and a weapon to use against speculators. Early in 1863, therefore, Newton persuaded Congressmen to supply him with the names of farmers, to each of whom he sent a brief questionnaire. Weeks later, replies came in from some 2,000 scattered throughout 22 northern states. The results were good enough to publish in July of that year as the government's first official report on the condition of major crops.

The system has grown in extent and in the frequency and speed and reliability of the reporting but the volunteer crop reporters—250,000 of them—are still on the job. They get a publication or two in return, but in the main they keep at it because they believe they are doing a useful and a helpful thing. Crop reporting is a routine service of the Department, long established and smoothly running. Emergencies, however—drought or grasshoppers or the boll weevil or flood—are

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

always subjecting the Departmental machinery to severe strain. Most recently it was the New England hurricane of September of 1938.

New England's timber resources were perhaps as hard hit as anything in the path of the storm. The Department's foresters found 3 billion feet of timber down, more than 4½ million acres of forest land damaged. Worse, a resource for industry and labor seemed hopelessly lost. The fire hazard in the damaged forests was excessively great and what fire might miss, insects and plant disease could soon consume. Under the leadership of the late F. A. Silcox, brilliant chief of the Forest Service, an emergency organization was at work in the forests of New England a week after the hurricane. State and town committees worked with foresters to plan the salvage operations. Crews of WPA men and CCC boys cut fire lanes, built roads and emergency telephone lines, established a network of emergency forecasting stations for fire-weather warnings. By the middle of 1939 fire hazards had been cut down to normal on 76,000 of the worst acres and 6,000 miles of roads and trails had been cleared. Sixty days after the hurricane the Northeastern Timber Salvage Administration, extending government credit to timber owners, received its first load of logs, inspected and ready for the mill. Purchase agreements have since been signed for 1½ billion board feet of logs, most of which have been going into neighborhood ponds and other delivery sites selected by the foresters and the local people jointly. The timber will be secure against fire, insects and disease and it will be fed to the lumber market only as the market can comfortably take it.

But scientific research in the efficiency of production, distribution and consumption does not make production, distribution and consumption efficient. In 1932 the farmers' cash income had dropped to 4.7 billion dollars from a 1929 total of 11.2 billion. The farmers thought action was indicated. Thirty-cent wheat, 20-cent corn, 5-cent cotton are not desirable fruits of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

science. Something more than more bushels of wheat or pounds of cotton per acre, something more than lower costs of production per unit, must be the objective if agriculture and the rest of the national economy are to attain an efficient and satisfying relationship. As Henry A. Wallace, recently Secretary of Agriculture, said, a government that promotes increased farm efficiency and then refuses to help farmers solve the results of that increased efficiency is criminally negligent.

Since 1933, therefore, the Department of Agriculture has engaged in what have come to be called "action" programs. These authorize the Department to help farmers affect or control certain economic institutions. The first of the new action agencies in the Department was the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, better known as the AAA. Though it was somewhat mutilated by the Supreme Court's emotional surgery in 1936 the AAA has survived and has even grown new flesh to cover the unhappy scar. Its emphasis is laid not so much on production control per se as on diversion from soil-depleting to soil-conserving crops, plus direct payments to farmers as compensation if a cash crop is lost in such a diversion. There are between five and six million out of a total of roughly seven million farmers participating in the AAA program and putting better than 80 per cent of the cropland of the nation under plan in the interests of soil conservation and adequate farm income. In 1938 the AAA asked American farmers to keep the acreage of soil-depleting crops within roughly 290 million acres, to adopt appropriate soil-conserving practices wherever they could and to put as much land as possible into soil-conserving crops (some of which are not cash crops). The AAA promised for its part that the income of farmers conforming to this program would not be jeopardized—that under such a program market prices would be closer to a fair exchange value and that the gap remaining between market prices and fair exchange value, or parity, would be filled in with benefit payments so far as funds permitted.

In that year, with farm prices averaging well below parity,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the AAA disbursed $640,000,000 in benefit payments—8.5 per cent of the farm cash income. In return the farmers harvested 293 million acres of soil-depleting crops, 3 million acres above the goal but about 12 million acres below the average for the preceding ten years. They made new seedings of legumes and grasses on 30 million acres, improved 200,000 acres of farm woodlots, did reseeding and contour ridging on 28 million acres of pasture, spread 5½ million tons of limestone and fertilizer and used special erosion-control practices on another 16 million acres.

To many observers the method of administration is as striking as the size and boldness of the objective. In every farm county in the United States farmers have elected certain of their neighbors as community and county committeemen to administer the program. There are 100,000 such committeemen and 23,000 community committees. It is their job, within the framework of the law and the limitations imposed by national goals, to recommend acreage allotments and soil-building goals and practices and to enforce them once they are officially approved. Since their expenses come out of the benefit payments allotted to their own county the farmers who elect them have a direct and very obvious interest in efficiency and fairness of administration.

The making of acreage allotments, farm by farm, draws upon a reservoir of economic data the Department has been collecting and collating for many years, and to which at frequent intervals it adds new data on crop prospects and production, supplies on farms and on the market, exports and the prospect for exports, prices of things the farmer sells and buys. Similarly the soil-conserving practices induced by the AAA payments have first been tried out more often than not on some of the 900 research or demonstration projects administered by the Soil Conservation Service in 47 states.

All this is "action" largely concerned with production. Marketing agreements and surplus removal programs hit more directly at marketing. The rotund phrase "orderly marketing"

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

presumes to describe the objective. Specifically, most of the 40 marketing agreements now in effect either establish minimum prices to producers of specific crops (for example the milk-marketing agreements, like the state-federal machinery now operating in New York City) or else, to avoid both glut and scarcity, regulate shipments to the market on a basis of volume and quality grades. Neither kind of agreement can go into effect without the affirmative vote of an overwhelming majority of the producers.

The now well-known food stamp plan stems from this effort to dispose of surpluses once they have been produced. It stems also from the conviction, held quite as firmly in the Department of Agriculture as outside it, that for many of our crops (though not all) the problem is less one of overproduction than of underconsumption induced by maldistribution of income. Before the stamp plan went into operation the Department's surplus removal program in fiscal 1939 diverted two billion pounds of food from the market to supplement the diet of 10½ million persons on relief. The stamp plan, operating through the usual channels of distribution and replacing the old method of distribution of surplus farm products through special public warehouses, is scheduled to be in effect in 150 cities by mid-1940. If the stamp plan is widely expanded it will have significant implications for agriculture as well as for the health of millions. Experience thus far has revealed an enormous potential demand for dairy and poultry products and for fruits and vegetables on the part of people who normally cannot afford anything above a subsistence diet.

Unfortunately there is a disparity not only between agriculture and the rest of the economy but within agriculture. There are poor farmers and moderately well-to-do ones. The latter group is small, the former large and capable of division into all the known categories of poverty. Even in 1929 half the farmers of the United States produced only 11 per cent of agriculture's commercial output and had to live on correspondingly small cash incomes—in hundreds of thousands of cases

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

less than $300 a year. For this large group the Farm Security Administration of the Department was created. Since 1935 it has extended financial aid to more than 1,231,000 farm families, many of them at one time on relief, and it is currently helping 589,000 families to plan and finance their farming operations. The individual farm plan, worked out by the family with the aid of technicians, accompanies the farm loan and is coming to be regarded as of equal importance.

Seven out of every ten of these farmers are tenants. Many of them have been able to advance from sharecropper to tenant status and four-fifths of them for the first time have obtained written leases from their landlords. Neither banks nor other lending agencies would call these farmers good credit risks, or at least they have not in the past; yet FSA's experience since 1935 suggests that better than 80 per cent of the money lent to them will be paid back to the federal treasury. Meanwhile farmers at the bottom of the heap have increased their net worth many times, have title to such simple instruments of production as a mule, a cow or a plow and have learned some things about the technique of farming and of living which will stay with them. They have, judging by the sample of 233,000 families reported on for 1938 by the FSA, increased their ownership of work animals by 75 per cent, almost doubled their number of total livestock owned and their acreage in feed and forage crops; increased the production of milk per family from 99 to 465 gallons a year, of meat for home consumption from 85 to 377 pounds and of eggs 400 per cent; increased the quantity of fruits and vegetables canned and stored from 51 to 221 quarts per family; increased their net worth (value of household and farming equipment and supplies, minus all debts) by $269 per family since the extension of the loan; and have been enabled to send their children to school regularly and for the full term.

In all of these activities and others far too many even to list here the Department of Agriculture plays a role as flexible and as diverse as the circumstances demand. I have haphazardly

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

selected a few activities at the expense of such others as rural electrification, or a whole vast system of land banks and farm credit, or farm labor camps on the West Coast, or a shelterbelt of trees on the Great Plains, or 130 subsistence homestead projects seeking a new pattern of rural life in a world for which old patterns seem no longer adequate.

Those who really seek an understanding of what makes this vast Federal Department tick would, I think, find the answer in science, in the land and in the operation of the democratic process. Within a few days after he had signed the bill establishing the Department of Agriculture Lincoln signed another bill setting up the land-grant college system. The two institutions began life together, have developed together and have worked together ever since. In the eighties the system of state agricultural experiment stations was established, intimately related to and in part financed by the Department of Agriculture. Still later, in 1914, the Smith-Lever Act created the Agricultural Extension Service, now an institution consisting of 48 state extension services with a coordinating group in the Department and drawing upon the researches of the Department and the experiment stations and upon the educational techniques and resources of the land-grant colleges. The county agricultural agent, now stationed in about every farming county in the United States, is the final outpost of the Extension Service and is therefore the active filter through which the product of the Department, the experiment stations and the colleges reaches most of America's seven million farmers. No other nation has anything quite like this, though some have begun to imitate it. No other federal department has an organization or relationship with the people remotely resembling it. It is democratic in inception and decentralized in administration. It is a mixture of federal, state and local funds and personnel. The powers and prerogatives of federal, state and local authorities are jealously guarded yet remain flexible enough to change with changing needs.

The land-grant colleges are the training ground for a high

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

percentage of the personnel of the Department, the experiment stations and the extension services. There is a continuous shift of personnel from college to station to Department and back again. There is a consequent unity of objective and broad continuity of policy which could probably be obtained in no other way. Much of the research cited in the course of this discussion was carried on cooperatively and could not have been developed by scientists restricted to a research center in Washington, D. C. An overwhelming majority of the personnel, moreover, were either brought up on a farm or acquired farm experience early in life, and somewhere along the way were exposed to science. The administrator who seems to be growing away from the realities and attitudes of the farm is an object of concern.

Now the Department and the state institutions cooperating with it are engaged in an adventure in democratic planning. During the past year 70,000 farm men and women have organized themselves into community and county land-use planning committees in 1,120 counties in 47 states. Field representatives of state and federal agricultural agencies sit with them, but the farmers are in the majority. They first develop a picture of the county's land resources, their present use or misuse and the adjustments needed. Out of their own knowledge, the farmers on these committees then map the land in the county, classifying it in terms of present and proposed use. Finally, they recommend policies or measures necessary to achieve the adjustments they think essential. The committees' recommendations combine farmers' experience with technicians' data and advice, but the ultimate decisions are left up to the farmers. They are planning for action by individuals or groups, by county, state or federal agencies.

One result will be many modifications in the present programs of both state and federal agencies, including the Department of Agriculture. A still more important result, to many of us, will be the strengthening, by use, of the democratic process among the people who by tradition and situation are in the most strategic position to strengthen it.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Tenure: Academic Question?

A Symposium

THERE are two "statements" on academic freedom and tenure before the public today, one endorsed by the Association of American Colleges and the other by the American Association of University Professors. The subject is of such importance to the lay as well as the academic person that although the two documents differ at only three points *The American Scholar* has asked men well acquainted with the issues in controversy to present them in its pages.

In 1925 the AAC adopted a statement on academic freedom and tenure which was likewise adopted by the AAUP and other academic bodies. The hope that this "statement" would be accepted by presidents and boards of trustees as a binding declaration of policy was, however, disappointed for various reasons; and by the end of 1938 a joint committee representing the AAC and the AAUP had prepared a revised "statement," quoted below, which it was hoped would receive "parallel endorsements" from these and similar bodies and would serve as a basis for an agreement on principles and policies between administrations on the one hand and the organizations representing faculty members on the other.

ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND TENURE

THE purpose of this statement is to promote public understanding and support of academic freedom and tenure and agreement upon procedures to assure them in colleges and universities. Institutions of higher education are conducted for the common good and not to further the interest of either the individual teacher[1] or the institution as a

[1] The word "teacher" as used in this document is understood to include the investigator who is attached to an academic institution without teaching duties.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

whole. The common good depends upon the free search for truth and its free exposition.

Academic freedom is essential to these purposes and applies to both teaching and research. Freedom in research is fundamental to the advancement of truth. Academic freedom in its teaching aspect is fundamental for the protection of the rights of the teacher in teaching and of the student to freedom in learning. It carries with it duties correlative with rights.

Tenure is a means to certain ends; specifically: (1) Freedom of teaching and research and of extra-mural activities, and (2) a sufficient degree of economic security to make the profession attractive to men and women of ability. Upon freedom and economic security, and hence upon tenure, depends the success of an institution in fulfilling its obligations to its students and to society.

Academic Freedom

(a) The teacher is entitled to full freedom in research and in the publication of the results, subject to the adequate performance of his other academic duties; but research for pecuniary return should be based upon an understanding with the authorities of the institution.

(b) The teacher is entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing his subject, but he should be careful not to introduce into his teaching controversial matter which has no relation to his subject. Limitations of academic freedom because of religious or other aims of the institution should be clearly stated in writing at the time of the appointment.

(c) The college or university teacher is a citizen, a member of a learned profession, and an officer of an educational institution. When he speaks or writes as citizen, he should be free from institutional censorship or discipline, but his special position in the community imposes special obligations. As a man of learning and an educational officer, he should remember that the public may judge his profession and his institution by his utterances. Hence he should at all times be accurate, should exercise appropriate restraint, should show respect for the opinions of others, and should make every effort to indicate that he is not an institutional spokesman. The judgment of what constitutes fulfillment of these obligations should rest with the individual.

Academic Tenure

(a) After the expiration of a probationary period teachers or investigators should have permanent or continuous tenure, and their services should be terminated only for adequate cause, except in the case of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

retirement for age, or under extraordinary circumstances because of financial exigencies.

In the interpretation of this principle it is understood that the following represents acceptable academic practice:

(1) The precise terms and conditions of every appointment should be stated in writing and be in the possession of both institution and teacher before the appointment is consummated.

(2) Beginning with appointment to the rank of full-time instructor or a higher rank, the probationary period should not exceed six years, including within this period full-time service in all institutions of higher education; but subject to the proviso that when, after a term of probationary service of more than three years in one or more institutions, a teacher is called to another institution it may be agreed in writing that his new appointment is for a probationary period of not more than three years, even though thereby the person's total probationary period in the academic profession is extended beyond the normal maximum of six years. Notice should be given at least one year prior to the expiration of the probationary period, if the teacher is not to be continued in service after the expiration of that period.

(3) During the probationary period a teacher should have the academic freedom that all other members of the faculty have.

(4) Termination for cause of a continuous appointment, or the dismissal for cause of a teacher previous to the expiration of a term appointment, should, if possible, be considered by both a faculty committee and the governing board of the institution. In all cases where the facts are in dispute, the accused teacher should be informed before the hearing in writing of the charges against him and should have the opportunity to be heard in his own defense by all bodies that pass judgment upon his case. He should be permitted to have with him an adviser of his own choosing who may act as counsel.

There should be a full stenographic record of the hearing available to the parties concerned. In the hearing of charges of incompetence the testimony should include that of teachers and other scholars, either from his own or from other institutions. Teachers on continuous appointment who are dismissed for reasons not involving moral turpitude should receive their salaries for at least a year from the date of notification of dismissal whether or not they are continued in their duties at the institution.

(5) Termination of a continuous appointment because of financial exigency should be demonstrably bona fide.

During 1939 it became clear that unless this "statement"

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

were revised the AAC would not endorse it; and early in 1940 the AAC's Board of Directors and its Commission on Academic Freedom presented a draft, revised at three points, to the Association's annual meeting.

In this new draft the last sentence of the third paragraph reads, "Freedom and economic security, hence tenure, are indispensable to the success of an institution in fulfilling its obligations to its students and to society"; the last sentence in paragraph (c) under Academic Freedom, "The judgment of what constitutes fulfillment of these obligations should rest with the individual," has been omitted; and paragraph (2) under Academic Tenure has been altered to read: "Each institution should define with great care the probationary period and notify every appointee of its precise length and its terms. Notice should be given at least one year prior to the expiration of the probationary period if the teacher is not to be continued in service after the expiration of that period."

On the other hand the AAUP has endorsed the 1938 "statement," unchanged. But though the two Associations have as yet been unable to frame a single statement acceptable to both, they are continuing their search for a common formulation which both will be willing to endorse.

Diverse Attitudes and Practices

HORACE L. FRIESS

I HAVE been asked to write briefly on the objective background of current discussions of academic tenure—the background of relevant facts, that is, which would remain so no matter what position is taken on issues in immediate controversy. Very diverse elements are to be found among these relevant facts. Close to the fountainhead of western academic tradition is the saint's legend of Socrates and his claim that a seat at the public tables would be a just reward for his devotion to criticizing and admonishing the citizens of Athens. The figure of Socrates serves as a symbol of the exalted predicament of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

those who claim just consideration and even special privileges from their fellows while they pursue truth; for a vigorous pursuit of truth, however beneficial, is also bound to be inconvenient and disturbing to things founded upon errors and prejudices. The tradition of academic freedom, developed in European universities, seeks to meet this predicament by insuring to members of academic faculties freedom of research, of publication and of teaching in the fields of their scholarly competence. But the effectiveness of such freedom obviously depends upon many conditions, among them upon the facilities for research and publication, the receptiveness of students and the standards of competence that are employed.

The tenure and the dignity of office has been one of the important conditions protecting academic freedom. The standards of religious orders, of noble estate and of civil service have all contributed to shaping the concept of academic status in the past. But just what this concept is and is coming to be in the U. S. A. of today is none too clear, because that concept partakes in the changes in society at large. Against a background of large and continuing changes in economics, government and society rather than against one of predominant fixity the American Association of University Professors has during the past twenty years joined with other professional groups to define principles of academic freedom and tenure. A resolution adopted by the AAUP in December 1938 is reprinted as a "Statement of Principles" in its *Bulletin* for February 1940. The key statement on academic tenure reads as follows:

> After the expiration of a probationary period teachers or investigators should have permanent or continuous tenure, and their services should be terminated only for adequate cause, except in the case of retirement for age, or under extraordinary circumstances because of financial exigencies.

The elaboration, defense and application of this principle almost always involves its recommendation as an instrument of academic freedom.

But there is a quite different factor which also underlies and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

envelops the consideration of academic tenure today. This may be loosely called the facts of supply and demand in the field of academic work (without thereby implying any theory as to the regulation, automatic or otherwise, of these facts). In some measure the shifts in educational demand that have already taken place work hardships upon those older scholars who find themselves saddened—if nothing more—by a marked neglect of their subjects. But the plight of younger men in the stages of preparation, with a desire for scholarly careers but without a certainty of even limited prospects, is more seriously demoralizing. Out of sheer self-preservation graduate schools continue to prepare large numbers of candidates for advanced degrees; but with shrinking educational budgets and the likelihood of extensive changes in educational programs no one can tell how these graduates, especially in humanistic and social studies, are going to be able to use their specialized trainings.

The prevalence of such conditions and their impact have led some to declare that "the problem of tenure has become largely a young man's problem in the teaching profession." Such a judgment has the further technical justification that the most widely advertised tenure programs, like that of the AAUP, do not as a rule include standards of limited tenure for instructors during their years of probation but concentrate attention upon regulating the achievement of "permanent or continuous tenure," mainly by professors. Unless limited tenure rights are defined for instructors in the probationary period these men are exposed to policies of rapid turnover in the junior ranks. And under the financial conditions obtaining today such policies bid fair to leave many of them stranded without prospect after they have completed expensive training and a year or two of teaching at low salaries. The prevailing proclamations of tenure policy may then come to seem almost like a conspiracy of the upper ranks to maintain their portion of a fixed or diminishing budget.

Of course there are some tenure programs, like those advanced for the New York City colleges by the New York College Teachers Union in which tenure rights for instructors are included.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But to illustrate the extremes of attitude and practice which exist on the whole subject one should note, by way of contrast, the "Revision of By-Laws" recently announced by Hobart College "to provide for conditions of tenure and appointment." At Hobart "under the new schedule only full professors have tenure and then only after three years of service." Moreover, it should be especially noted that "cause" for which professors, while on tenure, may still be dismissed "is defined as personal incompetency, financial exigency, *and necessary changes in educational policy*" (italics mine). Admission of this last may obviously open the door to drastic censorship of teaching. It is probable that many other colleges would hesitate to promise more in the present circumstances than Hobart now does, if tenure campaigns were at present aimed at more than a consensus as to desirable policies—if, for instance, they were aimed at the enactment of by-laws governing tenure.

Even the most liberal tenure policies are limited in the effective security they can offer the individual scholar by the dark cloud known as "financial exigency." Though the AAC and the AAUP programs explicitly state that such exigency must be "demonstrably bona fide," committees of the AAUP have already discovered that genuine budgetary straits sometimes create tenure difficulties. It is even more interesting to find an AAUP committee believing that in such cases "the duty of promoting a public sentiment in favor of more adequate support naturally falls upon leaders in the localities involved" and that active intervention by the AAUP would be impolitic. Such may well be the case; and yet it raises the question whether there is nothing teachers' organizations can do in cooperation with sympathetic and interested groups (e.g. civic organizations, labor unions, governmental agencies) to secure favorable financial and other conditions for education. Usually there are also unsympathetic groups to be opposed. American scholars and teachers as a rule, however, are prone to think in terms of academic procedures, and do not readily envisage participating actively in other types of effort to master social conditions. As

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for administrators, in the management of American schools there is much social service psychology mixed with business concepts, but ideas of public service and accountability are as yet underdeveloped. Useful courses and balanced budgets are general aims, but neither curricular nor budgetary proposals are regularly submitted to comprehensive and open tests of value.

Hence, though academic tenure seems to be a very special vocational problem, the effort to meet it intelligently today confronts American teachers and scholars with far-reaching fundamental issues. There is the problem of determining the detailed procedure and standards which should govern academic appointment and dismissal. From this there arises the question to what extent and in what ways teachers and scholars are prepared to participate in the management of education. And this leads finally to a third question—what relationships and affiliations with other groups and forces in society do teachers propose to enter into in furtherance of their educational aims?

To meet effectively the issues involved in this problem of academic tenure, as in the case of so many other matters at the present time, we need actually to reexamine thoroughly our conception of American culture together with the situation and the opportunities of scholars and teachers within it.

A Young Man's Problem

ERNEST J. SIMMONS

WITH some degree of success labor has been able to protect its rights; the teacher, however, is still a victim of that united front of timidity otherwise known as academic indifference. In the profession there is nearly always an unfortunate time-lag between the teacher's awareness that his rights are being surreptitiously encroached upon and the sudden realization that he has actually been deprived of them.

Educational organizations like the American Association of University Professors have consistently held one principle to be fundamental—that teachers, after the expiration of a proba-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tionary period, should have permanent or continuous tenure and that their services should be terminated only for adequate cause except in the case of retirement for age or under extraordinary circumstances because of financial exigencies. For the interpretation of this principle specific rules which would represent acceptable academic practice have also been formulated.

Educational administrators have not, however, willingly accepted the principle of tenure or the academic procedures which would translate principle into practice. The 104 cases handled by an AAUP committee last year plainly indicate the seriousness of the problem. And this number no doubt represents only a small fraction of the unjust dismissals occurring every year in our colleges and universities. Further, the swift growth of the American Federation of Teachers, a trade union affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, is in no small measure accounted for by the failure of educational administrators to recognize their teachers' need of economic safeguards. Only because of the united efforts of the unionized teachers did the city colleges of New York finally adopt the tenure laws which now serve as models for the presentation of similar demands in institutions of higher learning throughout the country. On the wave of the now famous Walsh-Sweezy case even Harvard University, after a searching investigation of abuses, felt obliged to adopt tenure regulations to protect its young instructors.

In the past the number of Ph.D.'s was hardly sufficient to cope with the demand for their services. Nor did they have to worry a great deal about retaining their positions, for administrators were somewhat loath to indulge in any rapid turnover of their faculties. Not dismissal, but refusal to advance a teacher, was often the only indication of an administrator's dissatisfaction. Of late this situation has radically altered. The teaching profession has been attracting more and more aspirants. Since the depression, on the other hand, the revenue of colleges and universities is becoming stabilized or showing evidence of decline. The resulting enforced economy has naturally affected men in the younger and middle groups, and in those institutions where

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

permanency has not obtained in the upper ranks even older men have been victimized. In general, the control of boards of trustees—or their equivalents—over appointments, promotions and dismissals is open to flagrant abuses in periods of financial exigency or when changes in educational policy are contemplated.

Essentially, however, the problem of tenure has become largely a "young man's problem." The young teacher is not blind to the necessity or even the salutariness of a competitive system. But though he expects to submit to a probationary period, he has a right to hope for eventual permanency if he acquits himself satisfactorily in terms of length of service and scholarly accomplishments. On the other hand he expects the limits of the probationary period to be clearly defined and he wants to know the criteria by which he will be judged and who will be his judges. Finally, he has a right to hope that during the probationary period his work will be so arranged as to afford him a reasonable opportunity to demonstrate the qualities by which he will be judged.

These hopes of the young instructor are legitimate and not excessive. In some institutions the teaching and administrative staffs have come together voluntarily and have devised tenure regulations which maintain educational standards and fair treatment for the younger men and at the same time are consistent with budgetary limitations; in a few others organized efforts have forced adjustments upon administrations. In many institutions, however, there have been wholesale dismissals coupled with a general unwillingness to face the issue of tenure squarely and openly. Educational needs have been sacrificed to unreduced budgets in administrative maintenance. Rather than cut salaries in the upper ranks, salaries in the lower ranks have been reduced or the young teachers have been dropped. In certain cases a policy of "cheap labor" has been deliberately followed and instructors in the middle group have been supplanted by less experienced and less expensive younger men. In fact, the unloading of young experienced men by some of the larger universities is creating pools of cheap labor.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But the question of tenure is not solely an economic problem. It is an educational one also, and upon its successful solution depends the morale of a faculty and ultimately its educational standards. As is well known, the real control of our colleges and universities resides primarily in the hands of bankers, lawyers and industrialists—that is, in non-academic trustees. Despite the service they may have performed for higher education in this country their attitude toward the serious problem of tenure has been persistently colored by their non-academic status. They regard it solely as an economic or labor problem and their approach to it often reflects the chronic belligerency with which they face labor problems in their own business world. They tend to resent any effort on the part of faculties to have a voice in budgetary concerns or in the rules and regulations governing the appointment, promotion or dismissal of teachers. Educational policy, they say, should be the sole matter over which any faculty should exercise even a modicum of control. But educational policy, obviously, is inevitably related to the budget since the effective carrying out of educational policy depends upon the selection of personnel.

A more serious aspect of non-academic control is the part it often plays in the tenure situation developing out of a violation of academic freedom. Many of the cases of unjust dismissal handled by the AAUP fall into this category. This is hardly the place to discuss the involved question of the teacher's right to intellectual freedom. Indisputably, however, the teacher's exercise of a citizen's right to free speech, particularly when it takes the form of minority protest, is often considered unacademic. The covert restraint of administrators—so frequently the direct reflection of the personal views of the financially-controlling non-academic trustees—serves to convince the teacher that his place is in the classroom (where he is expected to abstain from introducing controversial matter even though it may be related to his subject); and in institutions where there are no tenure provisions to protect the rights of the teacher, failure to submit to this kind of pressure has led to dis-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

missals. If a flat uniformity of intellectual approach on controversial subjects prevails in many of our universities and colleges, it is because it is dangerous to oppose the conservative views of the controlling interests. An administrator can so easily discover a budgetary difficulty that prevents the "much desired" promotion of a young progressive, and under existing conditions the heresiarch has no court of appeal. Nevertheless when the teacher is compelled to present controversial subjects in a manner grossly unrepresentative of the division of opinion in the community of scholarship or in the community at large a disservice has been done to the liberal spirit of education and intellectual freedom has been encroached upon. If the right of intellectual freedom means anything at all to the teacher it means the right to pursue the search for truth, and the liberty to express the results of that search, in and outside the classroom, unimpeded by any public or private constraint.

Obviously no good or sufficient reason can be advanced against the adoption of well-defined tenure regulations in all the institutions of higher learning in this country. Such provisions would not only serve the best interests of teachers; they would also serve the best interests of education. The ideal tenure system should be based directly upon the theory of competition. It is only necessary that the probationary period be explicitly stated and the criteria of judgment be clearly understood. And as a protection against violations of intellectual freedom or against any other cause of unfair dismissal any tenure system should include a court of appeal where a teacher would have an opportunity to be heard in his own defense by all bodies passing judgment upon his case.

Such a solution of the tenure problem will find no widespread acceptance until there is a democratic reorganization of the governments of most of our colleges and universities. Only under a system where problems are jointly considered by teachers, administrators and trustees and where policies are democratically decided upon and executed can satisfactory tenure regulations be devised and operated.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Professor's Obligations and Immunities

GEORGE BOAS

THE young man or woman who enters the teaching profession often does so not merely for the intrinsic interest of the work but also because of the probable security of the position. Salaries have never been the major attraction; their minuteness has been compensated for by the nobility of the profession—*praeses loquitur*—by the agreeableness of the conditions of work and by permanence of tenure. The last feature was of the greatest importance. A man who is thinking about whether he will have a job next year or not is hardly to be expected to devote himself wholeheartedly to research. That is undoubtedly why the AAUP has always coupled tenure with academic freedom; it is the necessary, if not sufficient, condition of utilizing freedom.

At the same time questions are bound to arise about the incompetent professor. The American Association of University Professors, as a professional organization, cannot assume that all its members and their colleagues are always in the right. It must recognize that if every teacher who holds a job is assumed without examination to be competent it will do the profession more harm than good. For not only would the assumption be contrary to fact—which is enough to condemn it—but it would make administrations so wary of appointing beginners that positions would be even more than at present the perquisites of the academic logrollers.

Assuming then that some professors are really incompetent, the Association is faced with the problem of picking them out. It would be absurd for it to lay down abstract descriptions of the incompetent teachers. Everyone is agreed that the "grossly immoral" professor ought to be discharged, once the gross immorality has been proved, but it is clear that this one distinguishing characteristic of the man who ought to be discharged is utterly irrelevant to the issue. It is easy to say that the teacher who doesn't know his subject ought to be discharged; but (1)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

who is to declare the man ignorant and (2) nobody knows nothing about his subject. A man who neglects his students might be called incompetent; but one of the greatest scholars at the Johns Hopkins University, Roland, the physicist, made neglect of his students programmatic.

It therefore seemed much better to state conditions of tenure in terms of years of service rather than in terms of teaching or scholarly ability. It seemed wiser to put the burden of proof on the administration and to maintain that after a man had served a given institution for a certain number of years he would be considered competent by the AAUP. In other words, if a man has taught without question as to his ability for the term decided upon the AAUP would assume the institution was satisfied with him and had no legitimate cause for complaint.

How long such a term should be was a matter of debate. In some cases a man shows what he is good for after two weeks of teaching; in others he has to teach for years before his real worth appears. A scientist, for instance, may be working on a problem which cannot be solved in less than three or four years. Meanwhile he publishes nothing, does his routine teaching, perhaps cutting classes every now and then, and gives every evidence of academic incompetence. A little faith in him and patience will be rewarded by the presence on the campus of a really great man whom other universities will delight to honor. Another man will begin producing early and then shrivel up. You have what is technically known as dead wood on your hands. Exactly how long must a man teach before he shows his real worth to his institution? Too many years will give you a man so old he cannot get a position elsewhere; too few years a man who has not fulfilled his potentialities. The period of six years decided upon in the 1938 statement may well require revision up or down; it does protect the young man by assuring him that after he has taught for a definite time the AAUP will consider him competent and will therefore protect his tenure.

That this was bound to result in hasty administrative action was inevitable and foreseen by the Council of the AAUP. What-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ever rule one might make is bound to cause hardships. The hardships it would cause are probably less important than the good it would bring about. It has already induced administrations to examine their faculties and to consider, according to their administrative lights, the academic value of the younger members. If the proper standards are used this ought to result in a general improvement of teaching bodies throughout the country. Men who are not to be retained on the rolls would be told so definitely and, it is hoped, without evasion. Is it better for them to be kept on in ignorance of what the administration thinks of them and finally, when they are too old to find a position elsewhere, to have a new president announce that their services are no longer required? I am now too old to represent the younger professor's feelings accurately, but I should imagine it were better to know one's reputation clearly than to be kept in the dark about it until action would be impossible.

Only one provision of the AAUP's ruling is mandatory—the stipulation that after a certain period tenure becomes automatically permanent. There is no provision that a man be discharged after he has taught for six years. That would be absurd. That some administrations have so interpreted the AAUP code is attributable not to the AAUP but to the administrations. It is true that the code permits an administration to discharge a man who has not taught for six years and thus provides a way for administrations to get rid of younger men who ought to be promoted and to fill their places with still younger men who will be only too happy to teach at smaller salaries. I doubt whether any law was ever made which could not be misused, and in any event the abuse of this law—in spirit if not in letter—would not be so great as the abuse of older custom. For presumably the man thus discharged is still young enough to find another job and if properly discharged his reputation is not seriously damaged. Not "seriously" if the case is handled decently, which is asking a lot of the human race. There will always be murmurings about Professor X who was dropped for reasons which become mysterious in the telling. But it still seems reasonable

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to believe that Professor X is better off, murmurings or not, than if he had stayed on in uncertainty as to his future.

The six-year rule was, it would appear, a sort of compromise between the demands on the one hand of the administrations who wished some definition of incompetence and some way acceptable to the AAUP of eliminating undesirable members of the faculty, and the demands of the AAUP on the other hand for some definition of conditions of permanent tenure.

Scarcely less provocative of debate is the provision that the professor shall judge when he has conformed to the proper moral standards. This would seem to give him freedom to act as badly as he wishes without giving the administration the power to tell him so. But it gives him no clear road to immorality; it treats him as an adult. If he behaves improperly the administration has only to bring charges and give him a hearing. The fact that he thought he was behaving properly does not prove his thoughts were just. Would it be preferable to make the administration the judge of his conduct? Administrations should be thankful they were not given the task of casting the first stone.

The author had no part in drawing up the new code and can speak therefore only for himself. Speaking thus he would declare that anything which makes conditions of tenure clearer and more intelligible will automatically work for the good of the profession. He has lived long enough not to be naive about human motives. Nothing is to prevent a wicked professor from doing good work until he has achieved permanence and then lying down on the job; and nothing, moreover, prevents a wicked administration from firing its faculty as soon as its members have served their years of apprenticeship. But the AAUP cannot be asked to remake human nature. We shall have done a lot if we guide it. We gain nothing by protecting the incompetent; we lose everything by favoring the arbitrary. We have a very delicate task on our hands and we must be just to all parties concerned. No compromise ever appeals to all concerned. But in general only compromises will work.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Flexible Administration or Inflexible Regulation

CHARLES W. FLINT

IN a field of high order, such as education, with oneness of purpose but necessary division of functions between groups, interrelations are better when defined by guiding principles than when controlled by procedural regulations. Upon principles all agree but procedures divide; why then add procedures? The flexibility of right-minded administration is safer than the rigidity of a regulation, even when the latter is diluted down as "endorsed policy" rather than "adopted rule." The principles of academic freedom are definitely agreed upon and violations are now relatively few. More than three fourths of the members of the teaching staff in higher institutions are not members of the professional association, the AAUP—a fact which may reflect in part the extreme individualism of teachers but may also be a significant tribute to the harmonious relationships prevailing in general in the educational field.

It is agreed that a professor should exercise his proper rights as scholar, teacher and citizen, without fear of reprisals from the employing group. A teacher has the right in public expressions and contacts to make either a sage or a fool of himself and, academically, neither to receive reward nor to incur punishment therefor. There is, of course, some technical value in disavowal by both parties of the institution's responsibility for the individual's utterances, but in the mind of the public such attempted dissociation cannot deprive the institution of the confidence generated by wise public service or protect its prestige from injury by the exhibitionist, the unpoised, the injudicious.

Accepted principles also provide that in public utterances a teacher should be accurate, temperate, respectful of the opinions of others, free from bias or bitterness. If he is not, to whom shall doubtful cases be referred? Why not stop with the statement of principles, leaving procedure to the good sense and justice of all concerned in the few and widely-differing situations that arise? At any rate why in the new "statement" en-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dorsed by the AAUP replace a procedure that has failed with the stipulation, "The judgment of what constitutes fulfillment of these obligations shall rest with the individual"—which leaves to the judgment of the person whose judgment is in question the decision as to what constitutes fulfillment.

It is also generally agreed that a reasonable period of trial should precede the granting of a continuing contract and that such tenure as is due should definitely begin at some specified stage in the relationship. Why should the AAUP wish to add procedural details such as a six-year probation, or a three plus three, or any other combination? Institutions vary widely; in harmony with the principles let each work out its procedure in the light of its own resources, tradition, program and organization. But six years! Both the instructor and the profession are safer with flexible administrative genius than with the impersonality of even a merely suggested norm. Termination of probation without promotion would brand the young man, and often unfairly. There are many variables in any situation—the condition of the teacher-market when the clock strikes ("We're in doubt but so many are available we can do at least as well"); the financial condition of the institution at the zero hour ("He's good but we can now afford an even better man"); the department just then happens to need a research scholar more than another able teacher or vice versa; some clever sycophant may eclipse a budding but slow-blooming scholar; an able man may be the victim of jealousies in the department.

Despite the best that can be done under a system of wise selection following sufficient probation, administrators are still confronted with dilemmas—an inherited faculty, tenure granted generously when in doubt, improved financial conditions, teachers who have developed into misfits, lagged behind educational progress, divided and diverted their interest and energy. When teachers much more competent than those on his staff are readily available what is the administrator's duty to the students, to the institution and to education-in-general, and what is his duty to the incumbents?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Flexible Administration or Inflexible Regulation

The AAUP and the AAC have agreed upon a process for dissociation after tenure has been established. Given the necessary time a sensible teacher, cooperating with a fair-minded and sympathetic administration, can ordinarily work out relocation in a situation for which he is fitted—the usual procedure. Confidence, however, in the backing of a militant organization makes some professors intransigent, and this has placed the AAUP in the position of unintentionally precipitating some of its "cases." Honestly disclaiming such intent, the AAUP indirectly but actually prevents many changes which should be made for the best interests of the teacher, the institution, the profession and, most of all, the students. Whether out of discretion or cowardice the administrator, weighing the alternatives, decides the institution will suffer less from an only partially competent teacher who wastes his students' time than from the imbroglio created by an attempt to get the teacher's cooperation in an effort to relocate him. Too many trustees are more eager that affairs run "smoothly" than that the institution render the highest "value received" to the students—"Better continue twenty semi-competents than have one seance with the AAUP."

Both "statements" refer to "charges of incompetence." The administrator's problem is rarely if ever with absolute incompetence but too frequently with the insufficient competency of the good. Tenure should, of course, provide security against arbitrary treatment. But does this mean security in a particular position? Tenure, we are told, is to protect "the good men, the strong men of the profession"—those who do not need it, do not ask for it and are concerned with it only for their less able colleagues. Or again its purpose is to make the profession "attractive to men of high ability and strong personality"—by protecting, in more or less competitive positions, weak and only semi-competent colleagues! Yet we must have tenure. Our dilemma is one of giving protection from what is still the real, though now relatively rare, menace of arbitrary and unfair treatment and at the same time of avoiding the stagnation growing out of a benumbing sense of immunity.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Let us be frank: justifiably or not, the AAUP has had an anti-administration complex and administrators generally have had an anti-AAUP complex. Administrators generally live "*in terrore*" of the AAUP; and the AAUP is proud of this achievement. But its success rests on a precarious foundation, for this fear is not synonymous with respect and confidence, and in but very few cases is it born of a guilty conscience.

Many administrators think the AAUP in its Investigations violates the very principles of justice it calls for in the investigation of teachers. Two or three professors leave their classrooms and laboratories, appear upon a distant campus as a "Committee" and then according to the AAUP's *Bulletin*, "*is* the American Asociation of University Professors so far as that college community is concerned." Officers of the Association acknowledge such investigators "need the qualities of mind characteristic of a judge, a jury . . ." and should be "able to evaluate facts and evidence objectively"; also that it is "not always possible to find investigators of the degree of competency desired" and that "members of these Committees are usually novices." It is surprising the results are not worse. But the "Investigation" is hardly a judicial procedure—charges (with copy furnished) are not formulated nor does the Association appear as prosecutor only, before an impartial tribunal acceptable to both parties. Per contra two or three "novices," reluctantly drafted out of sacrificial loyalty, engage in a grossly ex-parte procedure and act at one and the same time as detectives, prosecutors, jury and judges —and also, in many cases, as fellow-executioners in consigning institutions and administrators to academic obloquy in a pillory of print.

Let each group heed the significant voices from the ranks of both, calling for unity befitting the profession and, in cases of doubt or dispute, for joint action by at least the two groups most involved. Why not? Over 95 per cent of the administrators —presidents, deans, and heads of departments—have been teachers, and probably over 66 per cent are still part-time teachers.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Background for Hitler in German Thought

JULIUS SEELYE BIXLER

HOW can the Germans tolerate Hitler? Why should the most gifted of modern peoples submit to barbarian rule? Why does a nation with such magnificent cultural achievements find it so hard to live with its neighbors?

Questions of this sort continually plague us and the answers appear to be as far away as ever. Twenty-five years ago the word "Prussian" was used in place of "Nazi" but otherwise the problem was the same. During the last war the statement was sometimes made that the Germans have a peculiarly ruthless quality that appears in their politics and their philosophy alike. One widely-read article tried to prove, for example, that because Immanuel Kant and the Prussian army both stressed the virtue of obedience, German life could be described as devoted to a blind will to power. The fact that Kant was himself a democrat and a pacifist and that the kind of obedience he had in mind was not that of the Prussian army was overlooked.

After the last war we dismissed articles of this type as products of hysteria. Yet it is not hard to see that the same mood is upon us today. We find it not so much in what the English say, for as a whole they have shown admirable restraint, but rather in the work of our own publicists. A recent American book claims, for example, that the Nazis do what they do because the German people are what they are, and this half-truth is allowed to color the total estimate of German life and thought.

The more we ask ourselves why the Germans allowed the Nazis to take control of their national affairs the clearer it becomes that the question has no simple answer. It is easy to see today that the political events themselves followed a course

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which was far from inevitable. A little more conciliation on the part of France, slightly better timing in French and British policy, a few more men like General Smuts at Versailles, a longer life-span for Stresemann, or the award by Hindenburg to Brüning of the same power which a few months later he gave to Hitler, and the story might have been very different. If the political sequence was itself so unstable how can we hope to lay the blame on any single feature of German cultural life?

Yet the Germans have produced some of the world's best philosophical thought and some of its worst political evils and we cannot help wondering why this should be so. Is it not true, however, that in human life the best and the worst often have a common source and that one shades into the other imperceptibly? Ambition easily becomes arrogance, religious reverence turns into dogmatism, out of humility develop weakness and fear, so that what might have been the creative insights of genius become instead the perversions of insanity. This is more likely to occur in national than in individual life because it is when they act as members of groups that men are most completely dominated by impulse. The German is especially likely to act impulsively since he is not the stolid, phlegmatic type we sometimes think he is, but a tortured soul, keenly aware of the emotions which enter into his decisions, and prone to agonize over his failures and to take pride in his successes in a way which interferes with his critical judgment. The same sensitiveness that makes him a great philosopher or musician may contribute to his blunders in the field of human relations.

If we are to understand the failure of German thought to prevent the excesses of Nazi barbarism we should notice four things about German philosophy and the popular response it has aroused. First of all, the Germans as a nation have reverenced philosophy without always understanding it, and the ideas of the people have lagged far behind the insights of genius. Second, the extreme sensitiveness of German perception has led not merely to a devout religious attitude but also to a peculiarly active fear in the presence of the unknown. This has

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

prompted the German to seek security in a mystical bond which unites him to his friends and by the same token separates him from those he considers his enemies. Third, German philosophy itself has taken pride in national achievement and has at times followed a narrowly patriotic line of interest. Fourth, German philosophy has not remained on the level of abstract thought but has insisted on exploring the depths of personal emotional life. This breadth of interest has strengthened it as philosophy but has led to misunderstanding when untrained minds like the Nazis have tried to use it for their special purposes.

To speak of national traits in German philosophy or in any other aspect of German life is to run the risk of indulging in generalities which have no relation to actual facts. The nonsense which can result is well illustrated in such a book as Alfred Rosenberg's *Myth of the Twentieth Century* where the so-called German soul is traced to its origins in Aryan and Teutonic racial history. Actually, as is well known, the modern German is a combination of Teuton, Slav and Celt and his soul is the result of much racial cross-breeding. As a matter of common experience the traveller is likely to feel that Germany itself harbors two souls within its breast, and to most visitors the South German soul is much more attractive than the North. Indeed Germans themselves call attention to the difference.

Yet although the idea of German racial unity is a myth in a sense different from that which Rosenberg had in mind, it is clear that there is a German cultural unity, based on language and literature, and that it has given German life certain easily recognizable characteristics. One of these is the almost universal interest and pride in philosophical achievement. Germany names its streets after philosophers, puts their pictures on its stamps, makes holidays of their birthdays. It has been said no German chemist fills a prescription without pausing to wonder at the relation of the chemical elements under his hand to the universe as a whole. Until recently philosophy was a required subject in the university curriculum. The difference between Americans and Germans in this respect appears in the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

eagerness with which our psychologists and sociologists repudiate, while their German colleagues affirm, a connection between their work and the speculations of metaphysics.

In the winter of 1928-29 word spread through Germany that a new leader, from whom great things were to be expected, had arisen. This man was not a politician or the founder of a religious cult but a philosopher named Heidegger. To visit his classroom was to gain an idea of the magic of the word "philosophy" for the German mind. Heidegger came to class wearing an unusual costume and with an air of detachment, as though his real concern was with esoteric interests far removed from the press of daily affairs. A large hall filled to overflowing would greet him with an impressive stamping of feet, the sign of applause. When he reached the platform he would point to the door and a group of students would rush to close it. Then a moment of complete silence broken by the words, "*Nun, meine Damen und Herren, was ist Philosophie?*" One felt an atmosphere of tenseness as if an event of profound significance were about to take place. The eyes of the entire nation seemed fixed on this room, for the great course of lectures by the great thinker on the greatest of all subjects had begun.

Yet, as the lectures continued, an observer could not help feeling certain doubts about the genuineness of the interest shown. The attendance kept up well and each day had its ritual of applause, the rush to close the doors, and expectant silence. But to talk with the students was to discover that some of them had little idea of what was being said. The best ones did of course. The others continued to listen to this very subtle philosopher not because they understood him but apparently from a vague sense that he was offering something profound—and also because they thought it well to be seen at the lectures.

In the spring of 1929 Professor Edmund Husserl's 70th birthday was celebrated in Freiburg. Telegrams came from persons in all parts of the Reich, including a large number of government officials, expressing the pride of the nation in the achievements of its distinguished son. One could not help com-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

paring it with the 70th birthday celebration of Professor John Dewey held a few months later in New York. For Dewey's celebration educators and reformers were out in force, but official messages were conspicuous by their absence. Yet the feeling expressed for Dewey was genuine whereas at least some of that expressed for Husserl was a pose. Probably there were more Germans who understood Husserl and believed in his work than Americans who understood Dewey. But the official and popular expression of feeling was in part a sham. In 1938 Husserl died almost in oblivion. No wreaths came from the government and only a few courageous individuals among his colleagues attended his funeral, for Husserl was of Jewish descent.

Popular misunderstanding of what is supposed to be held in high esteem is only one factor, however, in the situation we are considering. The second point to notice is that German emotional sensitiveness has its own peculiar dangers and that consequently the German religious attitude shows its own susceptibility to abuse. The German is so keenly aware of the mysteriousness of the setting in which human life is carried on that his fear of the unknown seems to produce a desire for human companionship of an especially intimate type. In a recent issue of *The Journal of Religion* Wilhelm Pauck quotes a revealing passage from the work of Emanuel Hirsch, a theologian of Göttingen. We who lived through the upsetting years from 1914 to 1933, says Hirsch in effect, began to understand how the hidden God requires that a mystic bond of kinship be developed among men. Our world collapsed, he goes on, and God was shrouded in mystery. Then came the realization that God demanded a recognition on man's part of the holy human bond of kinship. "Whenever today we speak of blood and soil, of race and heredity, of honor and community, of true socialism, of sacrifice and duty, we speak of this holy bond."

One could hardly hope for a better illustration of the working of the German mind, or at least a certain type of German mind, when confronted by the experiences of religion. The same religious perceptiveness which has produced the deep

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

piety of German Lutheranism has at times led to a perverted fear in the presence of the unknown. The German is keenly aware of an other-than-human Presence and vividly conscious of the nearness of that which eye hath not seen nor ear heard. This leads at times to the sublime assurance of faith but it may lead also to the desperation of fear before the non-human which must remain hidden. Says Goethe:

> Awe is the best of man; howe'er the world's
> Misprizing of the feeling would prevent us.
> Deeply we feel, once gripped, the weird Portentous.

The German words convey the mood more effectively:

> Das Schaudern ist der Menschheit bestes Teil.
> Wie auch die Welt ihm das Gefühl verteure
> Ergriffen fühlt er tief das Ungeheuere.

It is this feeling for the "*Ungeheuere*," the "weird Portentous," which gives the German so much of his power and leads also to such fatal weaknesses. In the case of the modern German it appears to have led to an irresistible desire to seek the companionship of those allied to him by "blood" and "race" in order that he might have the security of tribal emotions of kinship as he faced the great unknown.

German romantic emotion brings with it an interest in human personality as a product of cosmic forces and also an interest in tracing human ancestry back to its non-human origins and in maintaining a creative relationship between the human self and the outside forces at work in the world. We may call this a concern for the soul and a concern for the soil. Because he is well known in America let us take Keyserling as a representative of this tendency. Visitors at Keyserling's so-called "School of Wisdom" at Darmstadt during the years between 1918 and 1933 found him lecturing to members of the old aristocracy who sought relief from the prevailing democratic trend of the time. No religious services were held and few religious terms were used, yet the atmosphere, as in the case of so many similar groups in Germany, suggested a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

religious cult. Like the followers of Johannes Müller at Elmau in the Bavarian Alps or the disciples of Steiner at the "anthroposophical" center across the border in Dornach, these people sought to combine learning with an experience which can only be called mystical. The mystical quality appeared partly in the hero-worship offered to Keyserling, partly in the feeling that the interest shown might easily become an interest in the occult, chiefly in the awareness that the problems discussed involved questions of man's origin and destiny.

In this setting Keyserling talked with romantic enthusiasm, as only a German can, of care for the soul and also, though he did not phrase it in this way, of care for the soil which has produced the soul. Cultivate your own individuality, he said. Make the most of what distinguishes you from other people. Be sure also, he urged, that the unconscious forces which have produced your soul maintain their creative activity. Your own origin differs from that of other men and you should develop your peculiar heritage. Each nation must have a special feeling for its immediate surroundings.

The German attempt to see the soul as the product of racial influences, which reach back into the creative life of the cosmos itself, emerges dramatically in the operas of Wagner. The presence of world-building and world-destroying forces which affect the individual through his racial inheritance can be felt in the restless movement of Wagner's music. The universal human problem is seen in terms of the German problem and emphasis is laid on the insights the German shares with his kinsmen because of the particular nature of the German inheritance.

Love of country and regard for one's kinsmen is, to be sure, not exclusively a German trait. Yet it seems fair to say that the Germans have exploited it in their intellectual life to a greater degree than have their neighbors. No one is more patriotic than the Frenchman, no one is more sure his institutions are the best in the world than the Englishman—to say nothing of our own habits in this respect. Yet the Frenchman or Englishman in his philosophy rises above his country's pro-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vincial outlook in a way which the German is not always able to equal. It would be hard to find in an English or French lecture hall anything like the intolerance shown in Heidegger's face and voice when, in reply to a student's question, he once remarked, "No Englishman could have thought of that." Even many Jewish professors insisted until very recently, "We are Germans. We cannot go over to France, for the ways of the French are not our ways and we cannot hope to understand them or they us."

It is dangerous to infer too much from individual cases, yet anyone who has studied German philosophy knows that much of it is characterized by a sublime assurance in the superiority of the German people and that the people themselves have been only too ready to take this teaching to heart. No charge of narrowness can be made against Kant, in spite of the attempt to link him with Prussian militarism, but not all his successors have been free from it. Fichte had a magnificent vision of a universal Kingdom of Justice to which each nation should contribute according to its gifts. His famous Addresses to the German Nation were written, however, just at the time when Napoleon's army was occupying Berlin. It is not wholly surprising, therefore, that he and his readers should have lost sight of the supernational quality of the Kingdom in their enthusiasm for the special role the Germans were to play. Their task, said Fichte, was to assume the position of philosophical leadership which belonged to them by right. It was by this element in his teaching that his countrymen were chiefly impressed.

Hegel is another writer with a vision of an all-inclusive totality who yet had the effect of confirming the nationalism of his readers. Hegel saw history as a process in which two opposed cultures always yielded to a third which combined the best features of each—as the Jewish and the Greek, for example, made way for Christianity. On the question of the final outcome of the process he was indecisive. Sometimes he pointed toward the Prussian state while at other times he looked longingly toward America. His readers, however, forgot the ref-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

erences to America in their enthusiasm for the possibilities that were Prussian. The great Schleiermacher also, inclusive as were his interests, had his moments of isolationism which left their effect on his followers. "I do not write," he said, for "those proud Islanders [the English] whom many unduly honor. . . . They are never in earnest with anything that goes beyond palpable utility." And "on them [the French] one who honors religion can hardly endure to look, for in every act and almost in every word they tread its holiest ordinances under foot."

German philosophy has also had an emotional strain which, desirable as it is in itself, has produced its own difficulties today. Just as we mistakenly think of the German as phlegmatic, forgetting how keyed up emotionally he is inside, so we tend to stress the abstractness of German thought and to forget its deep concern for the individual and his private feelings. But a philosophy of the feelings easily lends itself to abuse in the hands of those who are not philosophically trained.

When German philosophy has championed emotion rather than reason it has done so against a background of rigorous intellectual analysis and as a means of supplementing and rounding out its own insights. Its stress on "life" and "instinct" as opposed to "thought" has been a part of its total attack upon the human problem. To illustrate: Neo-Kantianism began with Hermann Cohen to play up the logical and mathematical aspects of the philosophical scene but went on, in the hands of Windelband and Rickert, to insist that the individual, the intuitive and the historical be taken into account. Phenomenology also was a system of logical analysis in the hands of its founder, Husserl; but it became, with Scheler, a theory of value, and by Otto was used to explore the completely non-rational character of the sacred or holy. In each case the revolt against "thought" and "reason" was carried on by men who understood the possibilities of "reason" but who felt they had been exploited in an extreme fashion. In the same way the philosophies which attacked the notion of "spirit" and called it a destroyer of "life" must be viewed as instances of a revolt against an overemphasis.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Unfortunately certain popular writers who lacked philosophical training and did not understand the background against which these claims were made took the appeals to life and instinct at their face value and made them available for the partisan purposes of the Nazis. Nietzsche, for example, is claimed by the Nazis as their own. They forget that he was a seeker for what he called "bloody truths," or ideas which represent the opposite of selfish desire, that he was passionately opposed to all forms of totalitarianism, and that so far was he from being a Germanophile that he once said "The presence of a German retards my digestion!"

Among the writers who have encouraged this misunderstanding Wagner occupies a prominent place. No one questions the depth of his insight as a composer. The pity of it is that his writings do not show the same depth, and that their emphasis on the primacy of "life," on the need for racial purity and on the divine right of the leader, have had so great an influence on Hitler and his associates. Here again the evil exists not as a positive factor, complete in itself, but as an abuse of the good.

We are told that Hitler has seen *Die Meistersinger* over a hundred times. Perhaps it appeals to him partly for the passing allusion in the third act to the superiority of German over Latin culture. The opera as a whole, however, is not a hymn to nationalism but a plea for the discipline of individual desires and partisan interests through the use of universal ideas; and the point it makes is that romantic feeling and classic form can achieve an effective synthesis. The classical ideal is represented as having become ponderous and pedantic in the hands of the aging mastersingers, whereas the romantic spirit of the young knight Walter is full of life and growth and confidence in its own power. The contrast is brought out in the opening bars of the opera where the rolling chords which announce the march of the mastersingers are contrasted with the lyrical melody of springtime associated with the youthful Walter and Eva. But Wagner himself suggests that the romantic worship of life and love can be carried too far, for at the end of the second act he

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pictures a street brawl in which unchecked instincts produce a state of complete chaos. And although his apprentices dance a triangular caricature of a waltz, Wagner suggests that awkwardness comes from immature experience and cannot be found in the classical idea itself. The climax is reached when Hans Sachs shows Walter that personal enthusiasm must be submitted to the universal standards of reasonable taste. The result is the prize song which not only wins the hand of Eva but starts the whole city of Nürnberg singing. Wagner seems here to hint in the broadest terms that life must enter into a productive combination with thought and that only when it wins the universality of reason will desire actually be satisfied.

One cannot help feeling that this is the voice not only of the real genius of Wagner but the real spirit of the German people. Every instance of narrow patriotism in German life can be matched by another showing how broad a view of human affairs Germans may and actually do take. When the German is great he is very great, and to fix our attention on the worst that he has done is but to remind ourselves that the best itself is not far away. Each of us who knows Germany well knows how essential it is for the world and not for Germany alone that the proper environment be provided for the contributions only Germans can make. To remind ourselves what German life may be like at its best let us take one illustration, Albert Schweitzer.

Schweitzer, a German Alsatian by descent, is a philosopher, theologian, organist, author of the standard life of Bach, editor of Bach's works, and medical missionary in Africa. His writings do not neglect the various philosophical issues I have mentioned. In fact as philosopher he must be classified among those typically German thinkers who place life on the highest pedestal and expect to find in it the answer to the most searching problems of thought. "Reverence for life" is for him the ultimate philosophical formula, the final demand laid on thought itself. Yet in his hands reverence for life means neither a selfish provincialism nor the exaltation of a mythical folk soul but recognition of the claims of other life. I am life that wills to live,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

says Schweitzer, *and* in my will and what it means to me I understand what their own wills mean to others. Thus when I really understand what life is and what it requires I find in it the rule of love. As a philosopher Schweitzer turns to life, finds that it means love; and it is interesting to note that as a living man he brings life with its desires under the control of the laws of thought. This is seen in the fact that his writings reflect not his personal wishes but his respect for the ideal of truth; his playing of Bach minimizes his own individual interpretation and transmits the eternal musical forms which Bach heard and bequeathed to us; his life in Africa, where he devotes the white man's medical training and skill to the black man's need, reveals how completely ambition and desire can be brought under the control of the ideal of justice. A German Alsatian, working in Africa as a member of a French Protestant mission, supporting his work by lectures and recitals in Sweden, Spain and Switzerland as well as by help from America, Schweitzer exemplifies not only the productive unity that life and thought may win but also the positive contribution the German can make to the international scene.

In the summer of 1938 I said to an elderly Jewish professor in Germany, "Professor C., you have always told me to have faith in the German people. Do you still feel that they are to be trusted?" "Yes," he replied, "you must remember that they had to go through experiences which the others did not share. They knew what it meant to lose the war and then to bear the stigma of war guilt. Later came the reparations burden, borne by the younger generation which had no part in causing the war, and then the inflation which wiped out not only the great fortunes but the insurance and savings of the middle class. Suggestions of world disarmament which they made in good faith were rejected and these young Germans began to think of themselves as outcasts. In addition they have been very badly led. But the present leadership will not endure, and when it is over the world will find in the German people the same solid virtues it has always known that they had."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Miss Emily and the Bibliographer

ALLEN TATE

THE scene is a seminar room at a large American university. It is the first meeting of the year. The eager young man asks the professor a question. "What," he says, "is the ultimate purpose of graduate research in English literature?" The professor, whose special field is English bibliography of the decade 1840-1850, does not hesitate. "To lay the foundations of literary criticism," he replies. The eager young man is pleased because secretly and discreetly he hopes that some day he may hope to be a critic. A month later the bibliographer assigns the group a paper. "Gentlemen," he says, "we must maintain in these papers the graduate point of view. There must be no impressionism. There must be no literary criticism. Anybody can write that."

I came upon this tale about a year ago but a year before that I had read one like it in an essay written by Mr. John Crowe Ransom some time before the incident that I relate occurred. I began to wonder if Mr. Ransom had made it up; then I began to hope that he had, so that the witnessed fact should stand as proof of an insight. Without the witnessed fact Mr. Ransom (I assume for my purpose that he invented the tale) would be in the position of William Faulkner after his story, "A Rose for Emily," appeared. You will remember Mr. Faulkner's story. Miss Emily, a curious spinster, conceals the dead body of her lover in an upstairs bedroom until concealment is no longer possible. Nobody believed this tale; it was one of Mr. Faulkner's outrageous lies; it just couldn't have happened. Then it happened. This evidence of the decadence of the South emerged about three years later from a farmhouse in upstate New York. A middle-aged woman had killed her lover and kept the body.

Read before The English Club of Princeton University, April 10, 1940.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

For both Mr. Ransom and Mr. Faulkner the later facts confirmed the previous insights. Yet I must confess that for another reason altogether the analogy teases my fancy. Both tales are tales of horror, and I submit that the greater horror, for me, is in the scholar's insincerity. The analogy, like a good one, holds on more than one level. Must we not suspect that Miss Emily had a time of it conducting her intrigue in a provincial American community and that she probably, with the lover's last breath, breathed her sigh of relief? The need of judging him as a living man had been happily removed with the removal of his breath; the contingencies of personality were happily gone; she could have him without any of the social dangers of having him. She could now proceed without interruption to the reconstruction of the history of her love. But there was always the body and the body wrecks the analogy. Miss Emily's historical method recognized that it was the history of something it could not ignore and had to return to. But the specialist in English bibliography of the decade 1840-1850 would doubtless bury the body at once, concealing it forever; and he would never afterwards have to be reminded what he was doing the bibliography of. Or if you will give this figure yet another turn, the analogy is wrecked again, again in favor of Miss Emily. The body has got to decompose and its existence will become shockingly known—a crisis that the historical scholars conspire among themselves to postpone indefinitely; and if the wild discourtesy of the real world reminds them of it they say, "No, you are mistaken; we buried it long ago." But have they? Can they? And that is why Miss Emily remains a somewhat endearing horror for me. It is better to pretend with Miss Emily that something dead is living than to pretend with the bibliographer that something living is dead.

The bibliographer's belief that "anybody can write that" I wish to discuss later, when I get to some of the more dialectical phases of the question. Here I should like to set off against my frivolity what many literary critics have called the insincerity of the academic mind. Between the frivolity and the insincerity,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

between the ignorance and the irrelevant learning, the outlook for a literary criticism in our time is dark. But as a matter of fact, whatever may be said of the party of ignorance, it would be hard to maintain that anything like personal insincerity motivates the activities of the historical scholars. Every point of view entails upon its proponents its own kind of insincerity, for it is not the point of view, it is the person after all. Yet the evidence for the insincerity of our bibliographer is damaging: what, if not insincerity, lies back of his professed purpose which he, at the first showdown, shamelessly repudiates? How can he spend years laying the foundations of literary criticism when he thinks that anybody can write it? If anybody can write it does it need the collaboration of many generations of scholarship to lay its foundations?

There is insincerity here no doubt; for it is plainly an instance of a professed intention that one never expects to carry out or that one vaguely expects the future to perform for us. Does this not have an ominous and familiar sound? We hear it in the world at large and on nearly every level of our experience.

We hear it in politics, and the political voice has its counterpoint in the uneasy speculation of the journalist critics about the future of literature: some ten years ago we got from England a whole series of little books called *The Future of—;* and it is seldom that we get an essay on the present state of letters or even on a single book that does not look far beyond the occasion. We are asked as citizens to live only for the future, either in the preservation of democracy or in the creation of the classless society. Mr. T. S. Eliot has discussed this question in "Literature and the Modern World," an essay that I believe has not been reprinted in any of his books; he examines the point of view of H. G. Wells and sees in it the widespread eschatology of a secular, naturalistic philosophy. As individuals today we must subordinate our spiritual life and our material satisfactions to the single purpose of gaining superior material satisfactions in the future, which will be a naturalistic Utopia of mindless hygiene and Tom Swift's gadgets. There is no doubt that the most

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

powerful attraction offered us by the totalitarian political philosophies is the promise of irresponsible perfection in the future, to be gained at the slight cost of our present consent to extinguish our moral natures in a group mind.

The moral nature affirms itself in judgment, and we cannot or will not judge. Because the scholars as much as other people today are involved in the naturalistic temper, they also refuse to judge. The historical scholar says that we cannot judge the literature of our time because we do not know whether the future will approve of it. Is he not obviously evading his moral responsibility? I do not say he evades it as a father or as a citizen; but he does evade it in the specific field in which he ought to exercise it, since of that field he professes knowledge.

He has reasons for the Great Refusal, and the reasons are of curious interest and at the same time of critical importance. In order to express my sense of their significance I must go a long way round. I should like to begin by citing certain critical views held by Mr. Edmund Wilson, a brilliant historian of literature who because he puts literature above research may be expected to exhibit some of the values of the historical method when it is actually applied in criticism.

Let me make a broad distinction—so broad that if it is good it will be virtually a truism. Let us assume that English critics from the late Renaissance to Coleridge had a firm sense of the differences among the *genres* of literature and that they tried constantly to state those differences critically. Whether they succeeded in this task, from our point of view, is not the question; it is rather that they tried to look upon works of literature as objective existences with respect to the different forms.

Taking up this defeated tradition we still from time to time consider the relation of poetry to prose fiction. Our approach to this problem was adumbrated by Coleridge in a fashion that would have been unintelligible a century before his time: somewhere in the *Biographia Literaria* he remarks that a work of prose fiction will often have the imaginative qualities of poetry, no essential difference between poetry and fiction being

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

discernible. There are concealed in this view certain metaphysical assumptions, which we still use without awareness of the metaphysics. (In the study of "English" we are forbidden to "use" philosophy—which means that we are using it badly.) We say today that there is poetry in prose fiction and, wherever you have narrative, fiction in poetry. But it ought to be easy to see that the murk enveloping the question when we try to carry it further than this arises from a certain kind of fallacy of abstraction. We are thinking in terms of substance, or essence. Those who believe that poetry and prose fiction differ in some fundamental sense assume that poetry is a distinct essence; whether prose has an essence is irrelevant since it could not have the essence of poetry; and therefore, prose fiction being a kind of prose, it is essentially different from poetry.

Now Mr. Wilson easily disposes of this argument in a famous essay called "Is Verse a Dying Technique?" (by which I understand him to mean, Is verse becoming an unpopular technique?). He boldly denies to poetry an essence distinct from the essence of prose. In denying a difference he affirms the same essence of both: he thinks in terms of essence. He shows that *Madame Bovary* contains a great deal of "poetry" and concludes that the only interesting difference between a work like Flaubert's masterpiece and the *Aeneid* is that the one is in prose, the other in verse. That is certainly a difference; it is according to Mr. Wilson strictly a difference of "technique"; and he assumes the likenesses in terms of a common essence. Here we get the deepest assumption of the literary historian: the subject matter alone has objective status, the specific form of the work being external and mechanical—mere technique. This large essence common to all literature is human life. Both Flaubert and Virgil were concerned with it in its largest implications.

Nobody will deny this; but it is critically irrelevant to affirm it. Within the terms of this affirmation critical thought is impossible and we succumb to the documentary routine which "correlates" this de-formed substance with its origin, which by convention is called history.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Now the writers who see in works of literature not the specific formal properties but only the amount and range of human life brought to the reader are expressionists. Back of the many varieties of expressionist theory lies the assumption of the common or the distinct essence. If I say that the essence of *Madame Bovary* is different from the essence of the *Aeneid* and Mr. Wilson says that the essences are the same, we merely shout our opinions at each other and the louder voice prevails. The historical method will not permit us to develop a critical instrument for dealing with works of literature as existent objects; we see them as expressive of substances beyond themselves. At the historical level the work expresses its place and time, or the author's personality, but if the scholar goes further and says anything about the work, he is expressing himself. Expressionism is here a sentiment, forbidding us to think and permitting us to feel as we please. When the bored expressionist tires of the pure artistic essence he turns into the inquisitive literary historian; or he may be both at once, as indeed he often is.

The great historical scholars of our time are notoriously deficient critics, but critics they are nevertheless. I am far from believing that the bibliographer's defense of scholarship is acceptable to all the scholars, many of whom are certain that they are already doing for criticism all that is necessary. Do you want a critic? Why, we already have one—in John Livingston Lowes. Has he not given us *Convention and Revolt*? Yes, he has; but in the course of a few pages I cannot do justice to the historical scholarship that gave us the facile seesaw picture of the history of poetry, or to the poetic learning that permitted Mr. Lowes to take seriously the late Amy Lowell. The mere literary critics took Miss Lowell seriously for a while, but the literary critics were not scholars. If you will think of *Convention and Revolt* along with *The Road to Xanadu* you will see that the literary dilettante and the historical scholar can flourish without much communication between them, in one man.

Do we not here encounter one of the remarkable insights of the late Irving Babbitt? His *Literature and the American Col-*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lege, published in 1908, is still quoted, but there is no reason to believe its message has ever been taken seriously by the men who most need it. At that time the late J. E. Spingarn had not imported into American criticism the term expressionism. Mr. Babbitt called the dilettantes Rousseauistic impressionists; the historical scholars Baconian naturalists. Both dilettante and scholar repudiated the obligations of judgment because both alike were victims of a naturalistic philosophy. I believe Mr. Babbitt did not consider the possibility of their being the same man. He saw on the one hand the ignorant journalist critics, decadent romantics, for whom intensity of feeling was the sole critical standard; and on the other hand the historical scholars, who had no critical standard at all but who amassed irrelevant information. It was—and still is—a situation in which it is virtually impossible for a young man to get a critical, literary education. If he goes to a graduate school he comes out incapacitated for criticism; if he tries to be a critic he is not unlike the ignorant impressionist who did not go to the graduate school. He cannot discuss the literary object in terms of its specific form; all that he can do is to give you its history or tell you how he feels about it. The concrete form of the play, the poem, the novel, that gave rise to the history or the feeling lies neglected on the hither side of the Styx, where Virgil explains to Dante that it is scorned alike by heaven and hell.

Mr. Babbitt saw in the esthete and the historical scholar the same motivation. The naturalism of the scholar lies in his mechanical theory of history, a theory in which the literary object is dissolved into the determinism of forces surrounding it. The naturalism of the esthete operates on the psychological plane; he responds to the esthetic object in terms of sensation and if the sensation is intense the esthetic object is good.

Mr. Babbitt scolded these erring brothers for not making a moral judgment and it is just here that the limitations of his method appear. The moral obligation to judge does not necessarily obligate us to make a moral judgment. Mr. Babbitt's humanism contains some concealed naturalism in its insistence

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

upon the value of the mere substance or essence of literature: the subject matter itself must be moral in order to pass the humanist examination. The specific property of a work of literary art which differentiates it from mere historical experience he could never understand; and it is this specific property, this particular quality of the work, that puts upon us the moral obligation to form a judgment. Mr. Yvor Winters remarks that Mr. Babbitt never understood "how the moral intelligence gets into poetry." It gets in not as moral abstractions but as form, coherence of image and metaphor, control of tone and of rhythm, the union of these features. So the moral obligation to judge enjoins us to make not a moral but a relevant judgment.

The question in the end comes down to this: What as literary critics are we to judge? As literary critics we must first of all decide in what respect the literary work has a specific objectivity. If we deny its specific objectivity then not only is criticism impossible but literature also. We have got to decide what it is about the whole of a work of literature which distinguishes it from its parts—or rather the parts we can abstract from this whole and then distribute over the vast smudge of history, whence they presumably were derived. It is just a question of knowing before we talk what as critics we are talking about.

From my point of view the formal qualities of a poem are the focus of the specifically critical judgment because they partake of an objectivity that the subject matter, abstracted from the form, wholly lacks. The form of *Lycidas* is Milton's specific achievement as a poet in the convention of the pastoral elegy; but this convention, which is his substance, represents in itself only a subjective selection from Milton's historical situation. Would it not be simpler to seize at once the specific quality of *Lycidas* and try to understand it than to grapple with that aspect which fades into the immense perspective of history?

It would be simpler, if not easier, to discuss the form if we had a way of discussing it; yet before we can understand a literary problem we must first confess the problem exists. We no longer admit the problem because we no longer believe in the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

specific quality of the work of literature, the quality that distinguishes it from a work of history or even of science. As men of letters we no longer, in fact, believe in literature; we believe rather that the knowledge offered us in even the most highly developed literary forms has something factitious and illusory about it, so that before we can begin to test its validity we must translate it into an analogy derived from the sciences. The historical method is an imitation of scientific method: we entertain as interesting and valuable that portion of the literary work to which we can apply the scientific vocabularies.

Not being a literary historian I do not know when the literary profession lost confidence in literature; I suppose it was a gradual loss; we see its beginnings in the English romantics and we do not yet see the end. The rise of the sciences, their immense practical successes, even their moral failures, intimidated the scholars and I seem to hear them say, at first secretly and late at night when black questions cannot be gainsaid: "Milton's science is false and the scientists say that his moral and religious ideas have no empirical validity. But if I give up Milton I give up my profession, so I had better bestir myself to study scientifically Milton's unscientific science. We must get in on the wonderful scientific triumphs of the age. Nobody believes today that the arts give us a sort of cognition at least equally valid with that of scientific method; so we will just take the arts as fields of data for more scientific investigation."

The historical method is in the long run the unhistorical method. The literary historians are not first of all historians. We seldom get from them anything like Taine on English literature; no American English scholar has produced a work of the distinction of Carl Becker's *The Heavenly City of the Eighteenth Century Philosophers*, a book written not in the historical method but out of the historical imagination. It is a work of literature by a mind informed with a mature point of view and seasoned with exact knowledge (by knowledge I do not mean documentation) in many fields. Could Mr. Becker have written the book had he been trained in the belief that philos-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ophy, for example, not being "English," has no place in historical writing? Could he have written it had he been compelled to suppress all the resources of his intelligence but the single one employed in the mechanical "correlation" of literature with the undigested lump of history? Is there not an instructive moral in the distinction of Mr. Becker's prose style?

I am not attacking the study or the writing of history for use in the criticism of literature. I am attacking the historical method. I trust everybody understands what this method is. It reflects at varying distances the philosophies of monism current in the 19th century and still prevailing today. Because the literary scholar in his monistic naturalism cannot discern the objectivity of the forms of literature, he can only apply to literature certain abstractions which he derives, two stages removed, from the naturalistic sciences; that is to say he gets these abstractions from the historians who got them from the scientists. In the period when physics was the popular science we got historical studies of influences, conceived in terms of forces, causes and effects; then came the biological analogies that gave us organic periods where we attended to growths and developments; and today we have a broadening of the historical method which reflects the vast extension of scientific procedure in the semi-sciences—psychology, economics and sociology.

That this method is, in a definite sense, unhistorical it would not be hard to show. Under whatever leading analogy we employ the historical method—organism, mechanism, causality—it has the immediate effect of removing the historian himself from history, so that he cannot participate as a living imagination in a great work of literature. Even those scholars, usually men interested in the 18th century, who are concerned with the meaning of tradition conceive of tradition itself in terms of scientific analogies, so that there is something remote and mechanical about a tradition; and the tradition that we are interested in is almost always seen as a traditional "body" of literature, not operative today—not living, as the very word body implies.

This removal of the historian from living history has curi-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ous consequences. Because it is difficult—or too easy in some respects—to get historical documents for works of the present or recent past we refuse to study them. And we also refuse to study them because their reputations are not fixed. There is here the assumption, as I think the illusion, that the reputation of any writer is ever fixed. These two illusions—the necessity of documents for the study of literature and the fixed hierarchy of the past—are not necessarily consequences of the historical method: Milton complained of similar routines of pedantry at Cambridge. Yet perhaps more today than ever we get a systematic, semi-philosophical sanction for our refusal to study literature.

I take the somewhat naive view that the literature of the past began somewhere a few minutes ago and that the literature of the present begins, say, with Homer. While there is no doubt that we need as much knowledge of all kinds, from all sources, as we can get if we are to see the slightest lyric in all its richness of meaning, we have nevertheless an obligation, that we perilously evade, to form a judgment of the literature of our own time. It is more than an obligation; we must do it if we would keep on living. When the scholar assumes that he is judging a work of the past from a high and disinterested position he is actually judging it from no position at all but is only abstracting from the work those qualities that his semi-scientific method will permit him to see; and this is the Great Refusal.

We must judge the past and keep it alive by being alive ourselves; and that is to say that we must judge the past not with a method or an abstract hierarchy but with the present, or with as much of the present as our poets have succeeded in elevating to the objectivity of form. For it is through the formed, objective experience of our own time that we must approach the past; and then by means of a critical mastery of our own formed experience we may test the presence and the value of form in works of the past. This critical activity is reciprocal and simultaneous. The scholar who tells us that he understands Dryden but makes nothing of Hopkins or Yeats is telling us that he does not understand Dryden.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Perhaps the same scholar acknowledges the greatness of Dryden and the even more formidable greatness of Milton and Shakespeare; and if you ask him how they became great he will reply, as I have heard him reply, that History did it, and that we have got to wait until History does it, or declines to do it, to writers of our own time. Who is this mysterious person named History? We are back again with our old friend, the Great Refusal, who thrives upon the naturalistic repudiation of the moral obligation to judge. If we wait for history to judge there will be no judgment; for if we are not history then history is nobody. He is nobody when he has become the historical method.

One last feature of this illusion of the fixed hierarchy I confess I cannot understand. It is the curious belief that the chief function of criticism is the ranking of authors rather than their use. It is the assumption that the great writers of the past occupy a fixed position. If we alter the figure slightly, admitting that History has frozen their reputations, we must assume also that the position from which we look at them is likewise fixed; for if it were not we should see them in constantly changing relations and perspectives and we should think their positions were changing too. If you will now see this same figure as a landscape of hills, trees, plains, you will quickly become fearful for the man who from a fixed point surveys the unchanging scene; for the man, the only man, who cannot change his position is a dead man: the only man for whom the greatness of the great poets is fixed is also dead. And so, if we may look at this Homeric simile with the eyes of Bishop Berkeley, we must conclude that the great authors are dead too, because there is nobody to look at them. I have adapted this figure from one of the Prefaces of Henry James because it seems to me to be a good way of saying that the literature of the past can be kept alive only by seeing it as the literature of the present. Or perhaps we ought to say that the literature of the past lives in the literature of the present and nowhere else; that it is all present literature.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Confessions of an Unrepentant Wilsonian

ALBERT GUÉRARD

ON THE fourteenth of December 1918, from a balcony in the Champs-Elysées, I was a witness to Wilson's triumph. A stately parade down the magnificent avenue was a familiar spectacle; but never within my experience had ruler or victorious general been hailed with such religious enthusiasm. In the person of Wilson it was not a military ally that Paris was acclaiming but the prophet of a new dispensation. I was then an orthodox and ardent Wilsonian. I believed in the crusade to make the world safe for democracy, in the war to end war, in the Fourteen Points. And as an American soldier of French origin I was doubly proud to see our own principle, Liberty under Law, thus made available to all mankind and ratified with fervor by the people of my native city.

In a clever, thought-provoking little book, *If, or History Rewritten*, the most searching chapter is entitled *If Booth had missed Lincoln.* Alter the terms: If Wilson had been killed on December 14th! It was the last day in which the hopes of America, of the Allies, of the liberated nations, of the new Germany herself, converged toward the same goal. A martyr's death would have made that unique moment eternal and the Wilsonian ideal imperishable. Today the ghost of Wilsonism, ill-exorcized, haunts us and paralyzes our action. We dare not profess principles for fear they might lead us back into the forbidden path of Wilsonism. For nearly two decades a vague but ubiquitous and relentless pressure prevents us from mentioning the Wilsonian dream except with a sneer: fashion, in a democracy, can be more tyrannical than any dictator, for it insidiously warps our inmost thought. This stubborn and uneasy

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

refusal to think, this abject surrender of gentle reason to an unconfessed dread, this flight into cynicism as our sole refuge, constitute the deepest tragedy of the "lost generation." With maimed territory, squandered resources, a reduced population, the smart of defeat, a country may yet recover health and strength. A nation afraid to think is sick to the very soul.

Bury and forget Wilsonism we cannot: we know that some day, as the only alternative to anarchy, there must be a world law, binding upon ourselves as well as upon the least of the tribes. Neither can we revive Wilsonism "as of November 11th, 1918" and declare that since that date we have erred and strayed like lost sheep. The evils that followed are part of history; they must be overcome, they cannot be ignored. It will not do to ascribe all our ills to a small band of wilful men—sinister international bankers, vindictive foreign diplomats, machine politicians, parochial isolationists. They have their share of guilt; but just because, by definition, they were narrow of heart and narrow of mind they would have been powerless for evil without our complicity. A truly great cause cannot be defeated except from within. We must acknowledge that in the confusion which led to the final disaster Wilson, Wilsonism and the Wilsonians were greatly to blame.

We did not think hard enough; we took tempting short cuts that led us into a bog. In the conviction that fearless thinking alone can save us I propose in these few pages to probe our faith after twenty years, sparing none of its flaws. I can honestly claim that this enquiry has no immediate bearing upon the present conflict. The alignment of powers, the clash of ideologies, are different from what they were in 1914—and far worse confounded; in many cases our sympathies have veered. Our sole purpose is to recover the use of an indispensable instrument, to wit, our mind.

"Wilsonism" is not an abstract formula. It denotes the policy of a man and his followers at a given moment in the world's history. It is therefore relative and complex; all-too-human—that is to say full of absurd contradictions. The most obvious

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of these is the clash between the petty political creed of the man and the loftiness of his international outlook. Wilson was an idealist and stood above the strife, but he insisted on remaining a party leader. Had he not been a party man he would never have reached the Presidency. On the eve of the Armistice he made an appeal on behalf of Democratic candidates. Instead of taking with him to Paris a non-partisan delegation —what admirable lieutenants Taft, Hughes and Lowell would have been!—he refused to share power and responsibility. Yet he was indignant when others played the party game, when the struggle in the Senate became a partisan, indeed a personal, issue. He called desperately for a "solemn referendum," which is direct democracy and the negation of party politics. The party spirit he had so faithfully served was too strong for such a sudden conversion; the election was not a clear-cut vote on the Covenant but a scramble between two ravenous gangs.

This party orthodoxy in Wilson was not a moral flaw but an honest intellectual prejudice. Brought up in the party system he accepted it as final just as he accepted his religion. As a historian he should have known that the Founders detested parties, which they rightly called "factions." When the party spirit creeps into the management of army, church, university, shop or bank, integrity stumbles and efficiency departs. Because of the party blight we dread to trust even the simplest business to the State. Yet high-minded men to this day defend this as the only conceivable way, the American way par excellence.

Wilson was almost great enough to transcend his political upbringing. He did transcend it at one time, but in a dangerous direction. The prophetic spirit was in him and he conceived of himself not as the chief engineer of a machine but as a heaven-sent Führer. He felt that the conscience of the world was in his exclusive keeping; the people were with him everywhere, as against the vested interests, the official powers, the diplomats, the politicians. He thought he could appeal to Italy against Orlando, to France against Clemenceau, to America against a minority entrenched in the Senate as he had appealed to Ger-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

many against the Kaiser. A generous megalomania, in which there was a surprising amount of substance—his reception in Paris was a spiritual coronation. He was great, because he dared to be great; but, I repeat, he was not great enough. Perhaps also not coarse enough. He could be singularly generous, as he showed in his attitude to Soviet Russia struggling out of chaos; but he was a fastidious scholar, a gentleman and not a demagogue. Had he realized what it would mean for him to lead the masses everywhere against the privileged orders he would have staggered back—as Napoleon shrank when in 1815 the Lyons populace hailed him deliriously as the Emperor of the Jacobins. When it was discovered that the Prophet was also a conventional party leader and, in essentials, a resolute conservative, his mystic aura faded. To the Europeans he soon appeared as a foreign pedagogue, none too well informed, presuming to read them a lesson. The very magnitude of America's power made his assumption of authority ambiguous and unpalatable: Reason sounded less reasonable because it spoke from a pyramid of money bags. And America too resented the implication that he alone could bring the Tables of the Law. He was aiming at a spiritual dictatorship; and world democracy can brook no authority but persuasion.

No one impugned his integrity, intellectual as well as moral. It would be ludicrous to suggest that he was "bought" by Big Business or swayed by lying propaganda. He made up his mind slowly, according to the light of his Puritan conscience. And this, I believe, was equally true of his genuine followers. The cry of "Propaganda!" which propagandists are constantly dinning into our ears is not quite ingenuous. America was not fooled. For three years there was free propaganda on both sides. It was louder on the part of the Germans and clumsier also; Jusserand could sit back comfortably and let his Teutonic colleagues do his work. I was bombarded with pro-German literature in every shape and in all languages: poems by George Sylvester Viereck, psychology by Hugo Münsterberg and even magazines cooing dovelike in Esperanto. If

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

many chose to believe only the worst of the "Boches," if they elected to consider the British blockade as more humane than Germany's submarine warfare, it was because they had made up their minds when Belgium was invaded. It was conviction that determined propaganda and not the reverse.

Only after war was declared were the pro-German and pacifist elements suppressed. Then to keep a critical mind was declared disloyal. Days of deep humiliation for the thinking man: may they never return! But this intolerance—alas!—was spontaneous. It was not created or even fostered by the government. It was not Wilson who stopped the teaching of Goethe's language in numberless high schools. His administration did yield, as it should not have yielded, to the general hysteria. Perhaps reluctantly—remember that most Americans in those days accused Wilson of being tepid and wobbly. Opposition was silenced, as it was in France at the time, as it has been in the France of recent months: "*Je fais la guerre!*" Wilson forgot that he was a professor; he permitted public opinion to be influenced by the raucous methods of business, journalism and politics—by lurid advertising, sensational slogans, unashamed partisanship—in the vernacular, ballyhoo. We may dream of a world in which the masses will be enlightened by the cautious technique of the laboratory and the seminar. Then we shall have a democracy worth saving. That Utopian day had not dawned in 1917. In extenuation it may be said that the war spirit suspended but did not destroy our liberties. In America as well as in England and France peace restored complete freedom of thought and expression.

Perhaps Wilson might have secured fairer play for his adversaries. A far more difficult task was that of discouraging those apparent supporters who were at heart his most irreconcilable opponents, the ultra-nationalists. They rallied round him, on the principle of the chauvinist and the jingo throughout the world: "My country, right or wrong!" On the basis of "America first, last and all the time!" the war of 1917-1918 was not worth waging. Upon this point at least America is

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

unanimous. America's "honor" and "prestige" were not really at stake. We should have remained "too proud to fight." America's immediate interests demanded neutrality, under which we had been thriving; and it would have paid us handsomely to keep our ships away from the war zone. There was no justification for the war, except as a crusade for an organized world, transcending and almost negating local patriotism.

But the nationalists, true to a martial tradition, joined the Wilsonian front as soon as it became a battle front and to a disastrous extent they stole the show. To keep up the fighting spirit while discountenancing jingoism was a desperate enterprise. Wilson shirked the difficulty and perhaps never fully realized it. Insular by training, his sense of the world state was moral, reasonable, nobler perhaps because it was not instinctive and passionate. But he could not convey the living glow that was not in his own heart. That elemental fire the bellicose patriots did possess; in times of stress, unreasoning fierceness is an incomparable asset. America repeated with cool approval the Wilsonian formulae, but hearts throbbed to the beating of drums and the waving of the Stars and Stripes. So, even before the Wilsonian war was declared, it had ceased to be purely Wilsonian. When I joined the army I was appalled to discover that the permanent staff, from General Pershing on down was almost solidly averse to the Wilsonian ideal. And the Army mind became our national pattern.

So hopeless was the task that we may doubt whether Wilson should have undertaken it at all. We forget, in the bitterness of defeat, that he nearly succeeded. Not only at the time of the Armistice but repeatedly for ten or twelve years after Versailles it looked as though the Wilsonian spirit might yet prevail. The War to end War, although its immediate effect was to rekindle militarism, was not in itself an absurdity; and Wilson's decision, after all appeals to reason had failed, to apply "force without stint" was not in contradiction to his peace ideal. In his mind victory was to decide nothing except that henceforth conflicts should be taken away from the brutal

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

arbitrament of the sword and brought before a judicial body. The Germans allowed him no alternative: at no time before their complete collapse did they express themselves willing to discuss a peace in which military force would be no argument. Up to the last they pointed to conquered territories, not as charges against the Germans but as arguments in their favor in the final settlement. On such a basis, even a peace by compromise would have been a capitulation to ruthlessness. Wilson believed that the time had come for the reign of law.

In this the extreme pacifists stood against him as they stand against world organization today. No good, they claim, can be attained by evil means and war is fundamentally evil. Yet poisons are used as remedies, a surgical operation is a dangerous wound that may save a life and fire can be fought with fire. "Resist not evil," in its literalness, leads to pure anarchism; it would compel us to disband our police force as well as our armies; but wealthy pacifists show no desire, if a man grabs their coat, to let him take their cloak also. If it is legitimate for a Californian to defend the life and property of a New Yorker it cannot be anti-Christian for a Londoner to come to the aid of a Belgian. Unless we admit that moral principles expire at the frontier—but this is not Christian pacifism; it is nationalism in its most elementary form, *sacro egoismo.*

The idea that international law needs the backing of force is the heart of Wilsonism; but of course it is not peculiar to Wilson. It is embodied in practically every scheme for a durable peace. It was expressed with characteristic vigor by Theodore Roosevelt. It was endorsed by such gentle and cautious thinkers as Taft and Lowell. To the conception of a "League to Enforce Peace" Wilson was a late and perhaps a reluctant convert. In his mind, after this supreme effort the force needed to check lawlessness would gradually be reduced to the vanishing point. It was, and it remains, a reasonable hope.

There was a confused battle in the American mind, the old martial spirit contending with the new international idealism. The acceptance of the Fourteen Points by Max von Baden

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was a great victory for Wilson. The "bitter end" nationalists received it with dismay. The Armistice was a draw; the militarists felt deeply frustrated because they were not allowed to plow their way on to Berlin over a million corpses. But the German surrender was so unconditional that the military victory obscured the moral victory; it looked as though Foch and not Wilson were to have the last word. In an atmosphere of ambiguity and intolerable nervous tension, the Conference opened.

It is commonly asserted that Wilson, victorious up to October 1918, was beaten at the council table. I shared this view at the time; now it seems to me an exaggeration. If Wilson did not fully prevail at least he secured a workable compromise; and the reasons for his comparative failure are probably not those which are usually advanced.

For one thing, the picture of Wilson, an amiable, unworldly professor, fleeced by a gang of professional card sharpers, is an amusing cartoon but not a serious historical document. The Europeans were by no means so clever—or so wicked—as we are pleased to imagine. A President of the United States, after six years in office, cannot be wholly devoid of astuteness. Wilson was more than a match for the keener but more impulsive Clemenceau. It is very faint praise to say that Wilson knew and understood continental Europe far better than did Lloyd George; and his staff of experts was impressive.

The disaster for which we are still paying so heavily occurred unnoticed: it was the decision to turn the *preliminary* convention of the Allies into the final conference and to impose peace terms upon the conquered without any discussion. There was no debate on that momentous issue. The wrong turn was taken almost unconsciously, out of sheer weariness; no man can be held responsible for it; everyone, and particularly Wilson, must be blamed for failing to protest. The negotiators thought they were saving time: they have caused the world to waste a quarter of a century.

The wound inflicted by the *Diktat* of Versailles was entirely psychological. This does not mean that it was unreal. In such

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

matters it is the spirit that counts. Absurd as it might have seemed at the time the first care of the victors should have been to nurse back to health the spirit of a brave and unhappy nation. Foch was more generous than the civilians. The terms of his Armistice were, materially, of the utmost stringency but they were not humiliating. The Germans were allowed to retire in formation with their flags unfurled. They were accorded, as they deserved, the "honors of war"; it would have been wise to grant them also the formal "honors of peace." The Treaty of Paris in 1898 was "dictated" by the victors and the conquered had no choice but to sign on the dotted line; yet, because the forms of mutual courtesy had been respected, Paris did not rankle, although we took from Spain the very last shreds of her American and Asiatic Empire. Bad manners were the besetting sin of Lloyd George and Clemenceau; neither could be called a *gentle* man. In this case bad manners assumed the proportions of a catastrophe. That German manners, at Frankfurt, Bucharest, Brest-Litovsk, were none of the best, is perhaps an extenuation but no valid excuse.

It is this superficial ruthlessness, this vulgar desire to "show 'em who is boss," that created the ineradicable myth of a vindictive peace. A myth it is; but myths are more potent than sober truths. Paradoxically, in their actual terms the treaties of 1919 were by no means unreasonable. Most of their stipulations were clearly indicated in the Fourteen Points, which Imperial Germany had accepted even before acknowledging defeat. No peace was ever more thoroughly "discussed" than that of Versailles, with Wilson defending his points more authoritatively than the Germans could have done. Even the "guilt clause," if it had not been forced upon the conquered under threat of starvation, would have been acceptable. For it simply amounted to this: "By endorsing Wilson's principles, and by overthrowing their War Lord, the German people solemnly repudiated the 1914 policies of the Imperial Government."

I cannot here discuss every article of the five treaties. Two samples will suffice. It was not "vindictive" to dismember the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Habsburg Monarchy: failing to reorganize itself on a federal basis it had already collapsed. No one could imagine the Allies sending troops to Prague to restore Kaiser Karl. It was not "vindictive" to give Poland, as promised in the Fourteen Points, an independent access to the sea. Germany lived for twenty years with the "Corridor" and did not suffer thereby. Hitler of his own accord guaranteed the status quo to Pilsudski; and on the very eve of annihilating Poland admitted in his Sixteen Points the essential wisdom of the Versailles solution.

It is indispensable therefore that we should distinguish between the manners of Versailles, which are indefensible, and the actual terms—a complicated, imperfect compromise but not impossible as a starting point. It must be noted that no treaty was ever so promptly and so radically revised as Versailles and so uniformly to the advantage of the conquered. Lloyd George's nonsense, "Hang the Kaiser!" was quietly dropped. Reparations were repeatedly whittled down and finally canceled altogether—a lesson in elementary economics and international decency which our Senate has not yet taken to heart. The Rhineland was evacuated ahead of time. Germany was admitted into the League with the full privileges of a great power. And most important of all, for the *Vae Victis!* attitude of Versailles was substituted the friendliness of Locarno—an agreement freely consented to among equals.

We are told that Hitler is "God's answer to the Versailles Treaty": it must be borne in mind that, at the time of Locarno, Hitler was a laughingstock in Germany. What gave him his chance was a *second* economic crisis and not the one which had its immediate origin in the War, and from which Germany had recovered. It was the dismal, hopeless chaos so well depicted in Fallada's *Little Man, What Now?* Hitler crystallized every form of discontent; but his Versailles-phobia is as reasonable as his fanatical anti-Semitism or his "unextinguishable hatred" of Soviet Russia. He is not *our* Führer: we are not compelled to believe in his infallibility. We must, alas, take him tragically; nothing can force us to take him seriously.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Confessions of an Unrepentant Wilsonian

In 1920 I hoped we might reject Versailles because of its apparent harshness and ratify the Covenant as a preliminary to genuine peace. I said so in a public debate with Stockton Axson, the President's brother-in-law. Exactly the reverse happened. The men who thwarted Wilson in the Senate were not, as a rule, moved by pro-German sympathies. Our separate peace with Germany implied no moral repudiation of Versailles. It was the very idea of a binding international law that Senator Lodge combated. Even Lodge did not dare to oppose the League. He only objected to Articles X and XVI which would have committed America to the decisions of an international body.

Theoretically Wilson was right in considering these articles as "the heart of the Covenant." A League in which every member before taking any action could debate on his obligations—presumably in the light of his own immediate interests—would have been very feeble indeed. We are tempted now to condemn Wilson's refusal to compromise. It would have made a difference if we had joined—as it was then so easy—an inchoate World Government. The Lodge League, pitifully weak as it would have been, might have grown into a Wilson League; and the Wilson League, still far too loose, might have developed in its turn into a genuine Federation or "more perfect Union." Were not the Articles of Confederation ultimately superseded by the Constitution?

One thing is certain; Wilson's League never recovered from the blow of our great refusal. The "sacred egoists" everywhere were heartened by our example. Those who stayed in the League professed contempt for an American contraption that America herself had rejected. One by one the international anarchists, the "realistic," "virile," "dynamic" nations followed our lead: our isolationists have faithful and brilliant disciples in Japan, Germany, Italy and Franco's Spain. And, with the bitterest injustice, we reproached the Europeans for not making a success of an institution which we ourselves had sabotaged.

Then everyone fell upon defeated Wilsonism: isolationists of course, pro-Germans, Anglophobes, Gallophobes, "realists,"

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

idealists, radicals, pacifists—the strangest and most discordant pack. The vast American public did not actively take sides. Bewildered, it sank back into its wonted indifference to foreign problems. In its fatigue and irritation it had but one desire—not to act, and above all not to think; for action spelt danger and thinking was a pain. We had, year after year, the "solemn referendum" of weariness. Wilson was a broken man, physically and morally, before he disappeared unnoticed. And the inevitable result of his defeat was the second world war.

There are missed opportunities that never return. Louis XVI, through his failings as well as through his virtues, would have been an ideal figurehead for a constitutional monarchy; the Habsburgs almost realized a harmonious federation of the Danubian basin; Wilsonism could have been made to work in 1920. But, regret them as we may, we cannot bring back the Bourbons, the Habsburgs or Wilson. Wilsonism was based upon "reasonable" nationalism; experience has proved that nationalism could not be reasonable. Nationalism implies that ideals, traditions, government, territory, economic interests, should coincide. They never do. Even with the uneasy correction of "minority rights," nationalism is a Procrustean bed. It leads to "autarchy," which, for small nations, is an absurdity; and to "totalitarianism," which is criminal folly for all nations, great or small. We need larger economic units than Czechoslovakia or Poland; and economic union implies a common social legislation—that is to say a common government. We need freer cultural units than can be provided by any territory: Dante, Goethe, Tolstoy, should be read and loved anywhere in the world. Nationalism at its noblest is a tradition, a sentiment, a religion, not a matter of administration and financial profit; let it be divorced, like all religions, from the practical business of the territorial state. We need, not a League of jealous and independent nations, but a world Commonwealth with many autonomous provinces. Wilsonism is not ahead of us but behind us. It might have been the way; it is not the only way; and we are not disheartened because it proved to be an impasse.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The WPA Writers: Portraitists of the United States

KATHARINE KELLOCK

THE WPA Writers' Project, since its establishment in October 1935, has sent about 100 books to press and five times as many shorter publications. The backbone of the Project has been the preparation of the American Guide Series—guides to the 48 states, the territories and the largest cities of the United States; but the staffs have also compiled folk songbooks and county histories and almanacs and school textbooks, all with the major purpose of presenting the social, economic and cultural history of America. Succeeding the Guide Series and overlapping it is the American Encyclopedia Series in which the initial volumes will be state factbooks; this series will include the basic material on the social, economic, political and cultural life of the United States and will place special emphasis on the functions of state and local governments and the processes and course of democracy.

The varied items in the American Guide Series have been widely reviewed, nearly always with praise; but neither the individual works nor the series have had much literary appraisal. And as for the Project itself, though several feature stories have been written on its personnel and activities, there has not been even a suggestion that it was a laboratory in which much might be learned about American standards of writing and the public's conception of writers.

That critical appraisals have been rare is not surprising; literary criticism is little practiced in the United States. Moreover the interpolation of practical information and the use of typographical devices unusual in running text but needed in guides have intimidated most of the small band of literary critics, with

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

such notable exceptions as Robert Cantwell, Lewis Mumford and Van Wyck Brooks. Whereas the reviewers have skipped back and forward through the books, skimming over introductory articles on subjects that appealed to them and hunting out descriptions of towns and countrysides they happened to know, the critics have read the guides from cover to cover as they would novels. Mr. Mumford said that the series "demonstrated that guidebooks can be literature." Mr. Cantwell's conclusion was that the state and highway guides were a new form of literature that will "enormously influence the direction and character of our American writing" since the guides reveal an America that neither the historians nor the imaginative writers of the past had discovered. He might have added that they present a vast amount of new regional material that other writers are already incorporating in articles, stories and books.

But even Mr. Cantwell, while praising the guides, lamented their "clumsy form," unaware that the form was partly responsible for the results. Thousands of books had been written about America before the WPA guides appeared. For the most part their treatment was topical, though some, in a class very loosely called travel books, had a geographical approach. But practically all of the latter covered merely areas and topics that attracted the writers, with strong emphasis on material for which their favorite descriptive word was "quaint." Only the WPA guides have the mile-by-mile treatment that calls for a description of all towns and all countryside, attractive and unattractive. The need to find something to say about every community and the country around it forced the close scrutiny of town, hill and dale, the search for what makes each community differ from the others, that eventually created the first full-length portrait of the United States. And the search for words to express minor differences among towns superficially much alike helped to give the guides whatever literary merit they possess.

Even the best guides, however, have gone to press in a condition unsatisfactory to the staffs who produced them. Unlike

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Proust and Flaubert, the WPA writers have had to show results quickly if they were to continue to eat. Each essay and route description had to be put into final form as quickly as possible, with sections of the book in the hands of different editors. Consequently the staffs often had no conception of what they were building until the last piece was in place; in some cases trends and movements of importance became clear only during the final polishing when it was too late to go back and search for items that might lend further significance to the accounts.

Lewis Mumford has called the guides "the finest contribution to American patriotism that has been made in our day," a tribute very comforting to staff workers when wrestling over the inclusion of this or that item considered unflattering by shortsighted local censors. The fact is that work on the guides rouses a high order of patriotism in most workers; probably no other relief project drew as much freely-contributed overtime from staff members. It should reassure those who fear to acknowledge shortcomings in the American scene that close examination of every phase of American life and history by these workers, who above all others had some reason for being dissatisfied, only made them more enthusiastic about their native land.

On the whole, local censorship has rarely been a serious hindrance to honest work. Far more of the less admirable side of American life and history has gone into the guides than would have seemed possible in books sponsored by local public agencies and officials. In many cases, as the state came to life on the pages they were reading, the sponsors became so fascinated they failed to note the departure from the usual unreal Chamber of Commerce account. Moreover the more skilful workers learned it was not necessary to lay on the colors crudely—that a community, for example, could be characterized more effectively by careful selection of material from its own booster literature than by the use of scornful adjectives. In addition, local censorship forced the guide writers to examine all sides of controversial incidents, for an account showing no bias was less likely to be marked for deletion.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

When in 1933 the federal government began for the first time to help the states care for the abnormally large number of unemployed persons who had exhausted all means of private support there was general agreement on the desirability of a work program. The English dole system was considered largely a failure; more important, the American public had a hard-headed aversion to seeing large sums of money paid out to support able-bodied persons who gave no service in return. The need was so acute that applicants for work had to be assigned to some task as soon as federal funds were made available. It is not known who first applied the name "project" to the programs that, in the beginning, fully justified the name; they were frankly hurled forth. Ditching, leaf-raking and simple road-work were started everywhere while construction plans were being drawn up. But it was soon apparent that there were many applicants who could not do heavy manual labor; consequently sewing projects were set up for the women and clerical jobs in public departments were devised for the men. But these did not meet all needs. Every community had some unemployed people of education, elderly teachers and clergymen, for example, to whom it owed a debt it wanted to pay with a saving of their pride; it also had a new-poor class, composed of formerly prominent or influential citizens, for whom it wanted to do face-saving during what was believed to be a temporary period of distress. In addition there was clamor from unemployed teachers who wanted to teach, from lawyers to do legal work, from musicians to teach or entertain. Out of the varied needs and pleas came the first white-collar programs, some sound and others futile.

By 1935 it became so glaringly clear that, in general, unsupervised local administration of work programs was unsatisfactory that Congress set up the Works Progress Administration. Many reports on experiences in job-making were at that time available to guide the policy-makers in planning a coordinated work program for the whole United States. For the most part the new projects were to be initiated in the states along lines that

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gave at least mild evidence of community or state planning. A few programs, however, largely in the white collar class, were conceived on a national scale; and in order to give them efficient technical direction each was placed under the control of a national director. Among these federal projects were those to employ actors, painters, sculptors, musicians, writers, and allied workers; for administrative purposes they were lumped in an Arts section, which became part of the Professional and Service Division of the new agency.

The parentage of the section was peculiar. As the Works Progress Administration took shape, friends of the arts, especially in the influential metropolitan areas, began to dream dreams and see visions. Having heard of genius starving, and holding a low opinion of entrepreneurs in the arts fields, they seized on the new work program as the solution to the Latin Quarter's perpetual problems of finding the means for food and shelter—and also an unfailing patron. Almost every worthwhile artist could qualify for work relief, they assured one another, and soon the federal government would be fathering and producing the masterpieces—dramas, pictures, novels, operas, epic poems—a crude commercial world had scorned.

The champions of an arts program reached a sympathetic ear in Washington and were told to draw up projects. It was not long, however, before they learned that all programs had to be passed by a control board uninterested in art for art's sake and well aware that even the federal projects would have to have local approval. The writing of novels, plays and poetry as a major activity of a writers' project was ruled out almost immediately. Hundreds of plans were rejected before the guide program was reluctantly submitted. The chief comfort the champions of the arts could find in the plan was that the guides might be largely essays in which brilliant staffs could turn a blinding searchlight on America; it was a minor consolation that the program was not so rigid as not to leave quiet niches in which at least a few geniuses could be sheltered; and finally, it was remembered that, thanks to the A. F. of L. unions' de-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mands for an hourly pay rate for their members in line with union scales, all project hours would be short, and employees would have ample time in which to write fiction and poetry.

The guide project soon had administrative approval, for though the tourist business is one of America's major industries the United States is the only country in the world where even the indefatigable Baedeker gave up after one attempt to provide a guide. While relatively small groups of writers were vowing to perish rather than work for the guides, numbers of less lofty souls were beginning to be set to work to avoid starvation. As soon as the program was approved a headquarters staff and state directors had to be found and broad preliminary plans for the guides prepared and sent to every state. The first acute problem was to discover 48 state directors, for many of the persons desired were already employed at better salaries and with more promise of security than the program could offer. No one was sure what the qualifications of a state director should be; only later was it discovered that the ideal director was a combination of administrator, diplomat, encyclopedist, creative writer, personnel supervisor and publicity man. Some appointments were made on the recommendation of Washington advisers but most directors were unearthed by state officials and university faculties. The directors who initiated the program included novelists, state and military historians, publicity and advertising copywriters, teachers, reporters, newspaper editors, pulp writers and even one minor poet. That one quarter of the original directors survived to see through the press the state guides they started is surprising. The rate of survival was lowest among the historians; and it was far higher among the women than the men.

The writing experience of persons proposed as directors afforded some clue to the public's conception of a writer, though the unsuitability of those proposed for administrative posts might be discounted on the theory that other qualifications, presumably administrative, had been taken into account. But later experience with the types of workers recommended for employment by personnel offices, public officials and the general

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

public confirmed the initial impression. No house painter was ever sent to the Art Project for work, but the public and its representatives assumed that anyone who had ever managed to have his words printed was an author, in the literary sense. There were degrees of prestige, to be sure; any advertising or pulp fiction writer who had at some time earned a comfortable income always had more outside support for a top salary rating than the man whose carefully wrought work had had little monetary recognition. Oddly enough, former production of "a book" gave considerable prestige, even in circles considered educated, though the volume might be an illiterate compilation of historical data printed at the author's expense.

The rulings of the United States Civil Service Commission furnished proof of the universality of the idea that a writer is anybody who can qualify for a place in a spelling bee. This body gives professional ratings to editors and writers only if they are working on material covering a single subject rated as technical or professional. In other words the subject matter, not the presentation, is responsible for the rating. When the Commission assisted the WPA in classifying its headquarters employees, members of the Writers' Project who were writing and editing material covering architecture, geology, history and dozens of other subjects classified as professional and technical, were placed in the clerical class, though Project architects, historians and geologists were considered for professional ratings.

The popular conception of an author is important only as a clue to the popular evaluation of the writer's products. Staff members alone saw the grade of writing that was quite satisfactory to the cross-section of the citizenry who received the pre-final copy to check facts. The thousands of these pre-final manuscripts approved by official, technical and professional consultants without much criticism of structure and word usage are a good indication that the general American standard for writing is no higher than the standard for writers. Literary criticism by sponsors (representatives of publicly supported agencies who take responsibility for state or local projects and sometimes

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pay for publication) has been largely confined to the correction of the rare misspelling and the insertion of many commas. Some sound literary criticism has been received, it is true—most of it from unexpected sources.

The program of work was cruelly revealing, for the tasks set were not so simple as they might seem. Very early the misconception of a guide as a collection of essays was dispelled. Each staff was told to prepare brief articles on the economic, political, social and cultural history of its state and to describe every town and area of interest as well as the countryside, mile by mile. Of necessity most town descriptions had to be short; in two thousand words or less the writers had to present each town's history, contemporary life and points of interest. Six months passed before enough satisfactory copy had been assembled from the entire country to send out a small pamphlet of examples. But that even a small number could be collected in that time is to the credit of the workers. One of the many volunteers—well-known men and women who gave their time as consultants in order to help the Project produce the best possible guides to their states—had a harrowing experience of the difficulty of the work when he offered to rewrite the description of a short route he knew very well. He later agreed warmly with Lewis Mumford that the job "called forth the full literary capacity: the focusing of the subject, the acute observation, the novelist's insight into his material"—and it was his conclusion that many of the Project workers must possess talents never before brought into play.

It is impossible to say how many writers have been on the Project, though the payroll over the five-year period had consisted of an average of five thousand names. Of necessity the number of typists and file and record clerks has been large; in addition there have been map makers, photographers, architects, historians and other workers lumped as research or reportorial. Moreover, the labor turnover has been very high. One of the inevitable but regretted handicaps to production on the work-relief program has been the expectation that supervisors

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would encourage departure for private industry; and the whole program was given an element of insecurity to speed the process. A consequence on the Writers' Project has been a constant change in the personnel of the staff. In many cases the best workers have terminated their services at the time when they were most needed. But, fortunately, the turnover has not been confined to the groups most valuable to the work. Every state staff has been astonished to see employees whose copy was so far below project standards as to make them office problems leave for well-paid jobs on magazines and newspapers or in publicity offices.

The standard set for the guide writing early in the day did not seem high: it called for only those skills supposedly developed during secondary education. While it was hoped that Project writers would have insight, imagination and the ability to select significant facts, they were asked only to present material in logical order and in simple idiomatic English, with due respect for the meaning of words. The last rule uncovered the outstanding weakness not only among staff members but also among some professional volunteers: many did not know the meaning of common words, or if they knew did not take the trouble to exercise their knowledge. It is significant that much of the best writing for the guides was done by poets—workers who had seriously studied words and their origin. Lawyers, on the other hand, organized their facts better than many other workers but presented them clumsily and with appalling redundancies. Here and there good work was done by employees who had never considered themselves writers and who were taken from other Project tasks in emergencies. When they discovered that simple English, not mysterious jargon, was wanted they labored seriously and studied criticisms more carefully than did some who boasted of former literary triumphs.

That many of the relief workers, men and women whose words had gained them a livelihood in the past, could not meet the Project standards is a criticism of American education. But it is not the relief workers alone who show this deficiency in the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

use of their native language. The same weakness is reported in centers of higher education; instructors point out that large numbers of young people, graduates of the better public and private preparatory schools, enter college in a state of appalling illiteracy. That the colleges do not always repair the defect is well illustrated in graduate and technical monographs.

There is widespread agreement that the projects for writers have justified their existence: publishers have reported their value to the book trade in providing merchandise for which there is continuing demand; business associations have praised the guides for their stimulation of the tourist business; and there is a gradually increasing recognition of the contributions the relief writers' publications are making to an understanding of America.

Yet in 1939 Congress turned over administrative control of the units of the Writers' Project to the states. Control of standards was still vested in a national office, but the size of the staff in this office was greatly reduced. Each state administrator may now determine whether there is to be a writers' project in his state and what program it is to carry on. Although the great majority are giving full cooperation in carrying out the projects planned in Washington, the new conditions laid down by Congress for the administration of the projects are proving a serious handicap; a single administrator is able to detract greatly from the value of a series whose merit is partly dependent on the completeness of its coverage.

Further threats to the program are now cropping up in connection with the defense drive as some officials and superficial commentators begin to estimate how many planes could be purchased with sums spent by the government for less tangible items. Yet books like those produced by the writers' projects are needed as never before if Americans are to understand their heritage and the culture they are even now called on to defend. Unless they do understand it there is great danger that when the vast upheaval is over they will have lost their soul in trying to save it.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Culture Inside Nazi Germany

KURT PINTHUS

BEFORE, during and after Hitler's seizure of power one of the main tenets of the Nazi leaders was that the German press, the arts and the sciences were "Jew-infested, liberalistic and Bolshevistic-cultured" and that this seriously handicapped the rise of the young *volkhafte* talents in poetry, the theater, literature, the fine arts, music, journalism, the film and the sciences. Those forces were therefore weeded out radically by expulsion, imprisonment, silencing or killing if they did not or could not *sich gleichschalten* (conform to the Nazi *Weltanschauung*). The gates to all the realms in the arts, public life and the sciences were thereby opened wide for the new geniuses. But after six years Nazi leaders admitted that their hope of discovering geniuses and great talents had not materialized and that even the lesser talents could be found only in small numbers.

Yet the common assumption that production has ceased in all fields of culture, or that work of only negative value has been produced, is incorrect. On the contrary the Nazis, by using every kind of propaganda, by financial assistance and even by decree have encouraged cultural production in every field. True, Hitler and his men have voiced many variations of the theme that it does not matter if in politically disturbed times a people has no culture for a few decades; and as late as January 30, 1939 Hitler declared in a speech before the Reichstag that the "intelligentsia are a useless refuse of the nation." On May 21, 1933 the *Völkische Beobachter* (the leading newspaper of the party) proclaimed, "So long as an unpolitical, neutral, liberalistic, individual art is left in Germany our task has not been done. The artist who disregards this demand will be persecuted

This discussion is limited to the period from 1933 to September 1939.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as an enemy of the nation." Such art has been consistently eradicated.

Nevertheless, at no time has so much been done for the arts and literature in Germany as under the Nazi regime, even though with the aim, of course, of obtaining a party-political, and therefore purposeful, art and science. Never before has Germany given so many literary awards or arranged for so many festivals, official art exhibitions and meetings of authors. There is, moreover, a yearly book week during which, by every kind of propaganda and force at the government's command, the population is instigated to buy books.

If the talented artists subject themselves to the party doctrine they are absolutely pampered. At the opening of the Third Greater Germany Art Exposition in Munich in the summer of 1939 Hitler said, "To help art it is necessary above all to assure artists of the necessary working opportunities. That means giving them commissions to serve the times"—but "only through guidance and regulation from the top." And the same Hitler, in 1937, threatened at the *Parteitag* in Nürnberg to castrate painters whose vision did not conform. He has, however, done things to artists which are worse for them than being eunuchs. Not only has he had all paintings that do not please him removed from the museums as degenerate; the men who painted them are forbidden to sell their work nor may it be bought in Germany. Even so Aryan an artist as the greatest of Scandinavian painters, Edvard Munch, is *verboten.*

Such facts explain why, despite plentiful financial and propagandistic assistance, the creative people in the cultural fields have almost uniformly, even from the Nazi point of view, produced only works of minor importance. The terrible fear of giving offense and being ousted is omnipresent. One word from the Führer or Goebbels, one sentence in "the guillotine of the party," the Gestapo's *Schwarzes Korps* (with a circulation figure, incidentally, higher than that of any other German weekly), suffices to turn an artist or a scholar into a living corpse.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Germans have never been a people of great politicians but from Walter von der Vogelweide, the greatest poet of the Middle Ages, to Bismarck and Rathenau they have always had a great political literature. Yet the German people do not like political literature. *Mein Kampf* reached its gigantic circulation only because of an incessant application of force—e.g. the giving of a copy to every couple who marry. Despite constant pressure the *Völkische Beobachter*, which every official is forced to read, had in 1938 a circulation of only a little more than 500,000. But never has more political literature been printed than in the Third Reich, and if the number of books published in Germany has remained about constant up to 1938—25,000 annually—one of the main reasons lies in the enormous number of the often very slender political books and pamphlets. The volume of sales, however, and the inclination of the reading public to buy have diminished enormously. Exact figures on the books sold in Germany are unobtainable; but despite the wiping out of unemployment the decline in book printing is considerable according to official statistics.

Everyone knows that the German press has been coordinated. But few people realize that Hitler's complete control has been supplemented with nearly complete ownership. Employing every form of pressure, Mr. Amann, Hitler's wartime sergeant, bought up the newspapers throughout Germany, metropolitan and provincial, for a fraction of their actual value. In the first year of the Third Reich the number of daily papers dropped from 3250 to 2300. In the place of those which vanished, among them some of the oldest (such as the 230-year-old *Vossische Zeitung* and the 290-year-old *Königsberger Hartungsche Zeitung*), a great crop of party weeklies and monthlies came into existence. I have mentioned the *Schwarzes Korps* as the paper of the Gestapo and the S. S. The Hitler Youth, the students, the S. A. men etc. likewise have their own publications. With their harsh style, their special aggressive jargon and their technique of quelling the unspoken opposition of the people by setting it down in question form and then proceeding to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

answer the questions, these publications have established a new genre. The man who knows how to read between the lines and wants to know what is really happening in the party, in business and among the people must read these papers.

Of course all the periodicals, those published for scientific and popular-scientific purposes as well as for entertainment, have been forced to "coordinate." Many have gone out of existence or have been combined with others, but in their places have appeared radically Nazistic magazines. Only a few strictly philological-historical journals, such as the 200-year-old *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen* or the *Forschungen zur Brandenburgisch-Preussischen Geschichte*, have not been tampered with. The scientific periodicals more concerned with timely problems have had to change their character and in many cases also their titles. The literary-historical *Euphorion* has become *Dichtung und Volkstum* and the famous *Minerva, Zentralblatt für die Gelehrte Welt* is now called *Geistige Arbeit, Zeitung aus der wissenschaftlichen Welt.* Most of the popular monthlies carrying fiction and non-fiction make concessions to Nazism but strive for a certain neutrality in their reading matter. The purely Nazi periodicals are mostly educational, with purposes that are at times strange—such as "for cultural-political and international spiritual collaboration" (in other words for propaganda work abroad). Totalitarian Nazidom's official paper for the entire field of books, *Bücherkunde*, has the subtitle *Organ des Amtes Schrifttumspflege bei der Dienststelle des Beauftragten des Führers für die gesamte geistige und weltanschauliche Erziehung der N. S. D. A. P. und der Reichsstelle zur Förderung des deutschen Schrifttums.* This title, which it is impossible to translate, is hardly intelligible in German. It tries to convey the idea that in this journal the highest authority, so to speak the Führer himself, is the judge in all things concerning literature, science and education. *Bücherkunde* measures every book in terms of party doctrine and its condemnation kills a book.

By stressing party politics, blood and soil, praise of the New Germany, and heroic optimism, and by demanding a Byzantine

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

flattery of the new rulers of the Reich, the party-political restriction placed on all literature chokes any potential achievement. The political pressure is all the more potent in creating a feeling of uncertainty because the official Nazi doctrine, although it is left vague, has by decree been made the basis for all cultural, and particularly for all scientific, activity. The complete abandonment of the anti-Bolshevist position (which had been so fundamental to Nazism that a new science with its own periodical, *Antikomintern*, and special institutes of research had been created) illustrates the radical alterations to which the official doctrine is liable. Italian Fascists and Russian Bolshevists were each in a position to publish, through their governments, a great new encyclopedia based on their respective doctrines. But National Socialism, owing to its vague and unstable principles, was unable to do so. Consequently those German firms who wish to publish dictionaries, lexicons, encyclopedias—so popular in Germany—face an almost insoluble task. The new editions of 1933 were useless immediately after the purge of 1934. But *der Meyer*, the most venerable of all German encyclopedias, has been most hard hit, for in 1937 a completely new edition of this huge work based, even to the minutest details, upon the Nazi doctrine of that time was brought out only to have its crushing condemnation of Bolshevism and everything pertaining thereto invalidated two years later by the fundamental shift in Nazi politics. Bolshevism may no longer be vilified, anti-Bolshevist books (which used to form a high percentage of the political literature published) have been withdrawn and Hitler himself has ordered *Mein Kampf* purged of its anti-Bolshevist torrents of abuse.

As its art of the state Italian Fascism adopted the expressionist art and literature which called itself futurism and made F. T. Marinetti, its leader, a professor, President of the Academy of Poets, and Supreme Controller of Art. In the beginning Russia also adopted expressionism as the art of the state—an art of revolt against bourgeois realism. This expressionist style on the Russian stage exerted an enormous influence upon the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

theater throughout the world. A few years ago, however, Russia suppressed this art form. Thereafter it was called bourgeois, formalistic, anti-revolutionary. The change was affected for a practical reason: the new forms had been unsuccessful in spreading socialist ideas among the masses.

In Germany the expressionists had had the same experience when, after the revolution in 1918, the masses did not understand their well-meant ideas for the improvement of mankind as couched in their ecstatic style. Voluntarily they shifted to the generally intelligible so-called New Realism. Hitler and Goebbels were smart enough, or perhaps mediocre enough, to adopt the art of mediocrity at once as the art of state. They felt it was intelligible to the middle classes and conformed to their outlook—those middle classes who had helped Nazism to power and through whom alone it can remain in power.

It was the expressionists, activists and dadaists of the period between 1910 to 1920 who had demanded the politicalization of the entire people through the politicalization of the arts. They had called their work a "movement" and had proclaimed propaganda as their goal. J. R. Becher said at that time, "*Der Dichter meidet strahlende Akkorde, er stösst in Tuben, peitscht die trommel schrill.*" ("The poet avoids radiant chords; he sounds the tuba, shrilly beats the drum.") Future investigations will prove that Nazism adopted many of the aims of the activists, expressionists and dadaists in a distorted form, along with their ideas on the rebuilding of community life and the rejection of the past. Consciously or unconsciously this indebtedness to expressionism may have led the Nazi leaders to eradicate all obvious traces of it. The very concept of the Third Reich derives from the literature of that period—notably from Moeller van den Bruck's *Das Dritte Reich*, published in 1922.

Expressionism had demanded Nazism's most important literary concept—the revival of the *Thingspiel*, the popular play produced in the open air before an audience of thousands; and it is no coincidence that the first two outstanding Nazi plays of this kind, Richard Euringer's *Deutsche Passion* and Kurt

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Heynicke's *Neurode*, were written by two former expressionists. Hitler, moreover, appointed an erstwhile expressionist and very leftist author, Hanns Johst, dictator in the field of literature—that is, Staatsrat (Counselor of State) and President of the Academy of Poets and of the Chamber of Literature.

Goebbels, whom Heinrich Mann calls a "renegade intellectual," was a recruit from the field of literature. He took his doctorate under the Jewish literary historian, Friedrich Gundolf, in Heidelberg and when he received no welcome from the modern writers of his time, but was accepted by Hitler, tried his hand at the literature of mediocrity with a novel, *Michael, ein deutsches Schicksal in Tagebuchblättern*, and a play, *Der Wanderer*, which was performed by a Nazi road troupe. In 1936, by Reich decree, Goebbels banned all art criticism; critics were restricted to description. (Few people are aware, however, that immediately after he came to power, and before he banned the liberal authors, Goebbels had banned his own play, even though the theaters were competing for the right to produce it.) Many actors and authors complained that the banning of criticism was a blow to their profession, for talent could no longer be distinguished from mediocrity by either the artist or the public. Gradually and quietly the prohibition has been partially lifted. But the small measure of literary criticism now permitted is attended by a threat to silence any critic whose comments displease an official.

When the Nazis came to power they looked for a leader in poetry and believed they had found him in Stefan George. Many connoisseurs of German literature consider George and Rainer Maria Rilke the greatest lyric poets of the first quarter of the 20th century. George, who lived in self-chosen, almost mythical seclusion, had predicted a new realm made up of spiritual, heroic people. In his last volume of poems, published in 1930 and called *Das Neue Reich*, he prophesied the Führer: "*er heftet das wahre Sinnbild auf das völkische Banner . . . und pflanzt das Neue Reich*" (he affixes the true symbol to the *völkische* banner . . . and plants the New Reich). That looked

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

like a prediction of Hitler and the Third Reich. Although everyone knew in what different terms George had envisioned the New Reich he was offered the Presidency of the Academy of Poets. But the old man, who loved Germany passionately, was terrified and fled into voluntary exile. Deeply grieved, he died in Lugano, Switzerland and stipulated in his will that he was not to be buried in Germany. Yet to this day practically every Nazi historian or literary historian quotes from *Das Neue Reich*. George had many disciples, and not only from among poets and scientists. His followers, a fairly large group comprising what George's former friend, Hugo von Hofmannsthal, calls the "conservative revolution," are now editing the periodical, *Corona*, which, though it is not approved by the Nazis, has not so far been silenced.

But outside of this current there are hundreds of thousands in Germany, of all classes and professions—doctors, lawyers, great and little officials, employees, businessmen, scholars and many, many young people who outwardly keep still but who inwardly stand apart. These do not read the party's literary and scientific books and papers but the independent literature of all countries. This is the secret opposition—the greatest and the most dangerous which Nazism confronts. When I am asked about the underground currents in Germany I mention this first. It is more dangerous than the dispersed groups of the former political parties. The Nazis themselves know this, for these people cannot be caught by the Gestapo like the politically active underground people. The Nazi press rages against them as "*Die Stillen im Lande*" but they do not answer, they do not defend themselves. They read books. They buy books. The booksellers know this and a great part of them secretly belong to this opposition. Almost every bookstore has a double face—one party-political (mainly in the show window) and one literary (on hidden shelves, for the "quiet in the land").

In the confusion after Hitler's coming to power a strange book rapidly became a bestseller, without the aid of the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

critics, without propaganda. *Das Herz ist wach* appeared under an English pseudonym and consists of the correspondence of an old English scholar with an aging intellectual German lady. A very tender book, full of feeling and spirit, it is, however, of no extraordinary artistic importance. Everybody read it, from the scholar to the stenographer, and soon 100,000 copies were sold. Then the *Völkische Beobachter* condemned the book because, although it was timely, the Third Reich was not once mentioned in it.

All books which have a wide sale and are really read (excepting, of course, the official party books) stand outside the party doctrine. They are, moreover, written by those men of the older generation who had already won a great following during the Republic and even during the Empire. Preeminent among them is Ina Seidel whose historical novel, *Wunschkind*, was one of the most widely read books of the past decade and of whose latest book, *Lennacker, das Buch einer Heimkehr*, 100,000 copies were soon sold. There is also a somewhat younger author, K. B. von Mechow, whose contemporary and non-political novels, *Ländliches Jahr* and *Vorsommer*, were great successes. Mechow belongs to a circle which, though associated with the party, stresses spiritual rather than political values and characteristically calls itself "*Das Innere Deutschland*." Furthermore there is the large group of Catholic narrators who stand on a remarkably high literary plane and whom the party dares not touch—Peter Dörfler, Ruth Schaumann, Leo Sternberg, Gertrude Le Fort; nor was the leading Catholic monthly, *Hochland*, forced to change its character.

But far more copies of *Gone with the Wind* (in a German translation) were sold than of any other novel. Through the bookstores 200,000 were bought, and an additional 100,000 through a book club, the *Deutsche Buchgemeinschaft*. Books by Hilton, Cronin, Erskine, Thomas Wolfe, Hemingway and Faulkner are extremely popular, 130,000 copies of *Anthony Adverse* were sold, and *Northwest Passage* was a bestseller. Without much ado booksellers dispose of great numbers of the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cheap Tauchnitz and Albatros editions in which the most important modern American and English books are published in the original.

All this alarmed the party, the Ministry of Propaganda and the Chamber of Literature. And their alarm increased when the number of German books sold in Germany receded, the number of translations from foreign languages increased tremendously and at the same time practically no German books were exported. It was even admitted officially that in 1936 the export of books had dropped to 25 per cent of the export in 1932. In commenting upon an inquiry made by the Ministry of Propaganda, Goebbels' *Angriff* for September 19, 1937 confessed that "a chronicle [sic] of difficulties opposes the German book abroad." And the trade paper, *Der Buchhändler im Neuen Reich*, says, "During recent years a steady increase in foreign literature can be observed on the German book market. At present this has led to an absolute flooding of certain fields of literature with foreign works . . . which . . . in many cases try to familiarize us with the selfsame negative values which we ourselves have painstakingly eliminated from German literature." Since "the principle of reciprocity has been disregarded to quite a catastrophical degree" the trade paper insists that the number of titles which may be acquired for translation from any single country be limited to the number of German titles that country in turn acquires.

But because of two factors literature within Germany is not nearly so sterile as is commonly believed.

For one thing the number of writers who were important or successful before Hitler's accession to power and who remained in Germany is very great. In 1936 and 1937 there appeared a yearbook, *Die Deutsche Dichtung*, which gives a rather complete survey of the better novels, short stories, lyrics and dramas published in Germany during that initial Nazi period. Even the professional historian would be surprised by the caliber of the authors on the list. It includes the veterans of realism, who

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are now more than 70 years old—Gerhart Hauptmann, Max Halbe and Max Dreyer; the really great dean of the women writers, Ricarda Huch, who recently published a new volume of her completely impartial books on German history; men like Rudolf Binding, Hans Carossa, R. A. Schroeder and Ernst Wiechert, who write in the fine classical tradition; some older men like Hermann Stehr, Emil Strauss, Wilhelm Schaefer, Guido Kolbenheyer, who at one time believed themselves misunderstood but in the Third Reich are considered classical; and many younger men of various hues.

Of the writers who did not leave the country almost all of the better, mature men together with the majority of the younger ones have taken refuge in the past—in an "escape literature" which deals with an enormous number of historical subjects.

The second factor accounting for the great volume of the book production has already been mentioned: the promotion of the younger men by the government and the party if their work is close to Nazi ideology. Publishers have received orders to introduce as many new authors as possible. Within Germany as well as elsewhere everyone knows how low in general is the standard which the new generation has set for itself. The latest surveys made by the Nazi authorities, Christian Jentzen's *Die Deutsche Dichtung der Gegenwart* and Helmuth Langenbucher's *Dichtung und Volkheit* hardly mention any poets whose work had not appeared during the Republic. The Nazis say in explanation that the authors are too close in time to the events they write of to attain a high level of creative productivity, that an "art grown from the people can develop only slowly" and that a great reading public is lacking because it is busy with the tasks imposed by party-politics. Even so, an unbiased observer will find some noteworthy talent among the greater number of the younger narrators.

A paucity of timely themes marks the majority of the novels inspired by the party doctrine. There are three patterns. The first is the *Zurück zur Scholle* (back to the soil) type, which Germans call *Blubo-Literatur*, an abbreviation of *Blut und*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Boden (blood and soil). The second is the *Zurück zur Vergangenheit* (back to the past) type, which concentrates on historical subjects because they are the least dangerous politically and because they present an opportunity of showing how great, heroic and instructive man and time were. The third is the *Lebensraum-Problem* (the problem of living space) type. Of the avalanche of peasant novels some of the best have been written by women like Margarete Schiestl-Bentlage. But Friedrich Griese is by far the strongest and most remarkable talent among those who write about the North German village (and was already acknowledged as such under the Republic).

The government and the party have concentrated upon helping young lyric poets and dramatists because verse and the theater offer the best hope of being used immediately as tools for propaganda. Two youthful lyric poets, Heinrich Anacker and Gerhard Schumann, have been crowned with awards, dignities and offices. Both of them, rhyming Goebbels', have accompanied the ascent and triumph of Nazism with enthusiastic songs. The Nazis praise their "steel romanticism" (which to others might appear to be "barbaromanticism"). Others who have been greatly praised are Hans Juergen Nierentz and Wolf von Niebelschütz. Niebelschütz is published by the S. Fischer house and in its *Die neue Rundschau*, formerly an outstanding literary journal, he is introduced with the following words:

> That old German unity of martial and inspired (*musisch*) convictions can also be found in his heritage. Men of such descent usually have a choice between only two possibilities: they are warriors of artistic convictions, or as artists they are martially obedient.

I quote this merely as an example of the kind of criticism characteristic of a periodical outside the party and representing the highest level of critical comment in the Third Reich.

The Nazi leaders immediately recognized a dual value in the theater: it was a common denominator in giving artistic satisfaction to the various levels of taste represented by a totalitarian state; and it could be used most effectively for propa-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ganda. Goering and Goebbels, one as protector of the State theaters, the other as protector of the *Volksbühne* (People's Stage) and Max Reinhardt's *Deutsches Theater*, the most important private theater in the Reich, were provided with ample funds and competed in promoting dramatic productions. The Labor Front forces the members of the Strength Through Joy to attend a certain number of performances per annum. Since by decree every stage in the Reich was made to risk world premières, they were practically forced to give every potential talent a hearing. Nevertheless of the 250 plays having a world première in 1936 practically all were written by men whose work had already been published and played during the Republic. And almost without exception the 250 authors chose historical themes. Because no criticism or discussion about the position or attitudes of present-day Germany is tolerated, the *Zeitstück* (a timely problem-play) which blossomed during the last years of the Republic has been eliminated. With great fanfare the official organ of the Hitler Youth did announce such a *Zeitstück* in November 1938—"Someone has now dared; he has written a 'modern' play. . . . Since expressionism such an experiment has not been made." But despite the advance propaganda the play, Franz W. Hymmen's *Beton*, was coolly rejected by press and audience. Contemporary Germany seems to prefer the light touch in its drama. In fact the December 1938 issue of *Die Literatur* reported that four of George Bernard Shaw's plays were being produced concurrently in Berlin and went on to deplore the great number of "entertainment" plays and the dearth of classical drama in the Berlin theaters.

From the artistic point of view the Berlin State Theaters, under Gustav Gründgens (who began his career with Reinhardt and Jessner, the exiles) are the best in the Third Reich. Gründgens, a brilliant actor as well as a director, is a typical intellectual, and as such is glaringly unlike the Nazi model man.

Of course the science of German literature was forced into complete coordination. I do not want to speak of such Nazi

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fanatics as Professor Heinz Kindermann but of the leading personality in this field, Julius Petersen, of the University of Berlin, who in 1934 recommended himself to the Nazi authorities with the book *Die Sehnsucht nach dem dritten Reich in deutscher Sage und Dichtung*. Yet Petersen has recently published the first of three volumes of *Die Wissenschaft von der Dichtung, System und Methodenlehre der Literaturwissenschaft*. This book, written objectively, a highly important study of the general science of literature and a fruit of profound scholarship, is the first great attempt to arrive at a methodic teaching of this disputed science. When he speaks of the race theory as a tool for scientific research in literature he goes so far as to say, "With amateur handling, where there is wishful thinking most of the time, the use of this theory has often led to false conclusions." The Nazi press recently lauded Urban Roedl's biographies of the poets Claudius and Stifter as essentially German books, but "Roedl" was the pseudonym of a Jewish literary critic. Many literary historians have for years subscribed to the new *Weltanschauung*, especially Joseph Nadler in whose standard work, *Literaturgeschichte der deutschen Staemme und Landschaften*, the authors are classified according to tribes—as Saxons and Alemans for example—or according to the section of the country from which they hail. Arno Mulot's *Die deutsche Dichtung unserer Zeit* is unwittingly a revelation of the dilemmas into which the Nazified literary historians are led by their philosophy. Writers listed in the first volume are grouped as peasants, workers, soldiers. But in the section dedicated to workers' poetry Mulot has had to omit all those proletarian poets who were leftists or members of the socialist parties.

Since the German classics were the main exponents and popularizers of humanism, Nazism often finds itself in an ambiguous position from which it extricates itself by wiping the classical slate clean of elements in contradiction to Nazi philosophy. Biedermann's fine collection of the conversations of Goethe was withdrawn from the book trade. Lessing is treated with utmost caution because of his friendship with Moses Mendelssohn and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

because of the liberality of attitude shown by his drama, *Nathan der Weise*. Schiller, with his insistence on freedom, is a hot iron. And Heinrich Heine is either a criminal or a man who never lived—although everyone knows that he wrote the most frequently sung of all German *Lieder*, the "Lorelei." For some time the singing of this *Lied* has been forbidden by decree; but even before the decree was issued the published versions of the song bore the inscription "author unknown." And once I read that the author of this song had been "unknown since 1933."

When in the French Revolution the Jacobins executed Lavoisier they declared, "Revolution has no need of savants." The Nazi revolution recognizes its very great need of savants, but a law promulgated on March 16, 1937 declares, "The scientist must demonstrate his usefulness to the nation or ——." Those sciences which did not conform to Nazi doctrines were almost completely abolished. Sociology was one of these. All of the most eminent German sociologists are now either outside the country or have been pensioned. The same holds true for many of the economists. Like the literary men, many of the scientists tried the escape to the past; but the economists among them were ordered to prove their ability as quickly as possible by publishing an article defining their attitude towards the Third Reich. Anthropology, of course, was forced to deliver itself over completely to Nazism's racial theories. The famous Society for Physical Anthropology was converted into the German Society for Racial Research. History itself, as Edward Y. Hartshorne says, "turns into one of the more subtle forms of propaganda."[1] Or, in the words of the Göttingen professor, Ulrich Kahrstedt: "We . . . learn history not to say how things actually happened but to instruct the German people from the past." Psychology depicts "the community soul and the racial types." Orientalism serves German diplomatic in-

[1] The best information to be found on German universities and sciences is given by Edward Y. Hartshorne, *The German Universities and National Socialism*, London, 1937; and "The German Universities and the Government," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences*, September 1938, p. 210.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

terests in the Near and Far East. Philosophy is transmogrified into Nazi *Weltanschauungslehre.*

The German professors do not write nearly as many books as they used to—partly their silence is voluntary and partly they are too much occupied with party work. I remember the words of a historian from Berlin University in answer to the complaint of a colleague that the party service left him little time to write books, "You can leave that to the Jewish colleagues. They have always done it nicely."

On the basis of the knowledge gathered from multitudinous and corroborating details we are forced to agree with Edward Y. Hartshorne when he says that "Speculative science is facing a severe crisis" and that "the humanist tradition vanishes which made German universities great. Therefore, political theology of a new God-race becomes the basic science." I shall not quote from Hartshorne's harsh general conclusion but rather from some remarks made by a highly placed Nazi official, Alfred Ingemar Berndt, at the 114th annual conference of the German Booksellers and Publishers Association held in July 1939; for they reveal the Nazi government's criteria for judging the literary or scientific book of the future:

> Does this book help my nation? Is it in harmony with the present situation? Is it designed to make the nation strong and to give it strength? Or is the effect of this book depressing, laming, destructive? . . . We need a political nation and must not lapse into that liberal epoch in which such an important part of the nation dedicated itself to spiritual and esthetic frames of mind and approached exterior events without understanding or in mental confusion.

The booksellers know that if they subscribe to this philosophy they will not do good business; they know that they will have to continue with their ambiguous game, which the better part of Germany has been playing throughout the years since 1933. For the "quiet in the land" and the lonely are those who write the best books and those easiest to sell; and they are the men who buy and read the most books. They continue the tradition of the true Germany.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the Workshop

Twentieth Century Mathematics

MARSTON MORSE

AN UNDERSTANDING of mathematics is latent in every intelligent person. Unfortunately this understanding is for the most part undeveloped and at times it is even denied. I have a friend who can argue almost flawlessly that he understands no mathematics, not realizing that the logic of his discourse proves the contrary.

Mathematics is both an art and a science, and the lack of appreciation of this fact is responsible for much misunderstanding. There is very little in the experience of the student sated with problems in arithmetic that makes him believe that mathematics is an art. Courses in geometry and algebra which degenerate into exercises in memory, add to the conviction that mathematics is dead and mechanical. Misconceptions with regard to mathematics are common even among those otherwise well informed. There is a literary critic of rank for whom mathematics is typified by the binomial theorem. To confound mathematics with its applications is general.

This confusion is as great in America as anywhere in the world. In France and in Italy, where the appreciation of the arts is high, the nature of mathematics seems to be better understood. Henri Poincaré has written that mathematics, the art of pure thought, is the highest form of art. In France and in Italy, as in ancient Greece, mathematics reached a high estate before the day of engineering applications. The uses of mathematics that were made by Leonardo de Vinci, Lagrange, Leibnitz and Newton did not conceal its inherent beauty.

To insist on the esthetic aspects of mathematical thought is not to detract from the merit of its applications. The development of mathematics for its own sake, and the practical applications of mathematics go hand in hand. Objective advances must be revised in form to make them esthetically acceptable and logically comprehensible, while advances of a more subjective nature, if complete and harmonious, will not long remain unapplied. Mathematicians are by no means agreed among themselves as to what is important either in content or in form. In

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the days when the relativity theory awaited its tests, its acceptance or rejection was a matter of taste. Otherwise convictions could not have been so violent. Mathematics grows best when tended by both artist and engineer.

These remarks concerning the nature of mathematics are necessary if one is to understand recent progress. I shall refer to advances which have been made in the present century and for the most part in the last decade. I shall try to give some slight answer to the ever-recurring question, "But what can one do in research in mathematics?" The idea that all essentials were discovered long ago is all too prevalent.

The truth is that higher mathematics has been revolutionized in the last fifty years and that the body of discoveries during that period is comparable to the advances made in all the preceding years. To clear away another source of misunderstanding one should explain in what sense research mathematicians use the word "problem." It is the sense in which Newton refers to the problem of gravitation, a philosopher to the problem of being, or an economist to the problem of equilibrium. It is more than likely that such problems admit no final solution. Contributions consist of new modes of attack, new theorems, or a new theory which relates the problem to other branches of mathematics. What is the nature of space, time, and matter? What is a system of logic? How are prime numbers distributed among all numbers? What is the mathematical meaning of probability? How is equilibrium defined mathematically, and under what conditions does it exist? What are the different possible kinds of algebra and geometry? Do electron phenomena admit a unified mathematical theory? These problems are typical of mathematical research today.

Questions such as these have an immediate intuitive meaning and have been selected in part for that reason. There are other problems which are equally important but for which the difficulties of popular exposition are nearly prohibitive. An attempt to convey to the non-mathematical a real approximation to recent mathematical ideas is an attempt at the impossible. My only hope is that my failure may be instructive and that thereby the reader may be encouraged to search more deeply.

Modern mathematics is particularly characterized by abstraction. This is partly a reflection of the taste of mathematicians and partly a matter of necessity. It is associated by some with the political and economic troubles of the day but I am more inclined to find its cause in the nature of mathematics itself. Popular opinion to the contrary, abstract studies are often simplest.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The process of abstraction rules out the irrelevant and permits greater generality. Mathematicians abstract in order to unify, simplify, comprehend and extend. The great complexity of modern mathematics, and its vast scope, make the process a necessity.

Mathematicians differ as to the value of abstraction as a mode of discovery. A large group believes that the most significant discoveries begin with concrete cases, and that the final abstract forms of mathematical theories are relatively obvious generalizations of these typical cases. There is one brilliant young mathematician who maintains that the process of abstract generalization may become an affliction for science and that the right to make abstractions should be rationed, the quota for each mathematician to be proportioned to his earlier contributions of a concrete nature. It is true that the tendency to start with abstraction is often an escape from the necessity of mastering the difficult and more concrete problems of classical mathematics. But one must distinguish between the tendency to abstract as an end and the use of abstraction as a means to an end. In any case it is too early to pass a final judgment.

Another characteristic of modern mathematics is its tendency to ignore the barriers between the different branches of mathematics, between geometry and algebra or algebra and analysis. This tendency is now so marked that the older distinctions between the fields of mathematics frequently become meaningless. A problem in geometry, for example, may be found to have a structure that makes it appear as a problem in algebra and from this new point of view the road to the solution may be clear. Such developments mark the maturity of mathematics and give it a new unity.

To approximate a universal knowledge is no longer possible, but it is still possible to think profoundly. In seeking to rebuild the foundations of logic, mathematical philosophers must indeed think deeply. Their efforts have been crowned with success, and the last few years have witnessed advances in logic unequalled since the time of Leibnitz.

Over a hundred years ago Lobatchewsky showed that the so-called parallel axiom of Euclid was not necessarily true; it could not be proved from the other axioms of Euclid. Through a point P not on a line L, there can be drawn, in the plane of P and L, one and only one line that never meets L. So runs the axiom and for two thousand years mathematicians tried to prove it. Lobatchewsky showed that there are geometries in which it fails, and that these geometries are as simple and complete as Euclid's.

Emancipated from the rule of the "obvious," mathematicians celebrated their freedom by the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

invention of numerous types of geometry, including the Riemannian geometry so important for the relativity theory. It was inevitable that this realism should extend beyond the bounds of geometry into logic. The attempt to put logic on a completely formal basis was begun some time ago. The *Principia Mathematica* of Russell and Whitehead was one of the first great efforts. To understand the need for such a work one has only to note the looseness with which classical metaphysicians use terms. Consider for example the dictum, "I think, therefore I am." In what sense shall one understand "I am"? The origins of such a phrase lie in the dim past. Mathematical logicians would begin again with symbols whose meanings, fixed at birth and preserved in logical alcohol, would be immune from all change or contamination. This procedure may seem cold, but it is necessary if science is to be firmly and permanently based.

I have space for the statement of one theorem in logic. It is the epoch-making discovery of a young Viennese by the name of Gödel. In any ordinary system of formal logic a proof of freedom from contradiction is formally impossible in the system itself. It is not that ordinary mathematics is affirmed to be inconsistent but only that its consistency is incapable of internal proof. From Gödel's theorem it can be inferred that no one system of formal logic can embrace all forms of correct reasoning.

The positive integers form the *raison d'être* of many a mathematician. Their pleasing, if deceptive, simplicity is in striking contrast with the perplexing metaphysics which threatens logic. Among the many problems which are associated with the integers is that of the distribution of the primes 2, 3, 5, 7, 11, etc. These are the numbers greater than 1 with no factors other than themselves and 1. Euclid showed that there exists an infinite number of primes. A little experimentation will indicate that the density of the primes decreases rapidly as the numbers increase. It can be shown that on the average there is less than one prime in every million consecutive integers.

To give a more precise result let N(n) denote the number of primes less than the integer n. For example, there are four primes, 2, 3, 5, 7, less than 8 so that N(8)=4. As we have seen N(n) tends to infinity with n. But N(n) is much smaller than n, in fact so small that N(n) divided by n tends to 0 as n tends to infinity. A result such as this shows that the primes are rare but it does not show how rare. To give a precise statement we shall consider the ratio n/log n. As n tends to infinity log n does likewise, but log n is so much smaller than n that n/log n tends to infinity with n. It was conjectured that N(n) and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

n/log n become infinite in about the same way, in fact that their ratio tends to 1 as n tends to infinity. This conjecture is called the "prime number theorem" and although brought to the attention of mathematicians over a hundred years ago it was not proved until 1896. Since then the theorem has been proved in simpler ways and various extensions have been made. There are, however, many related problems of great interest which are still unsolved.

We come to topology, a subject which belongs almost exclusively to our day. To define topology it will be helpful to begin with a definition of ordinary Euclidean geometry. Euclidean geometry is a theory of rigid bodies and rigid motions—that is, motions in which a body is neither stretched nor distorted. An edge of a rigid body may be straight, or two edges may be parallel. If the body is subjected to a rigid motion this straightness or parallelism is unchanged. More generally Euclidean geometry may be defined as the study of those properties of rigid bodies which are unchanged by a rigid motion.

To define topology one must broaden the class of motions so as to include motions which distort or stretch. These more general motions are called space transformations. They are termed continuous because they do not tear space at any point. Topology can now be defined as the study of those properties of configurations which are unchanged by a space transformation.

A closed curve tied in a knot is an object of study in topology because this property of being knotted is unchanged under any space transformation. From the point of view of topology, surfaces are regarded as in the same class if they can be transformed one into the other under some space transformation. From this point of view a spherical surface and an ellipsoid are in the same class, but not in the class of the surface of a doughnut (with a hole). We thus have a basis for the classification of surfaces and this has been fully exploited. When however one goes to higher dimensional configurations the field is wide open.

One of the favorite devices of modern mathematics is to consider curves, surfaces etc., as points. This is done to bring out the fact that certain relations between these configurations are abstractly similar to those between points. For example, the objects considered may be closed curves in ordinary space. Given two such curves one can move either curve so as to make it coincide with the other (assuming a physical body capable of moving through a part of another like a ghost). This movement can be made so that the maximum distance d moved by the points is the least possible. When so moved d will be termed the distance between the two curves.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This distance d is not the ordinary distance between the two curves but it has some of the essential properties of ordinary distance.

In ordinary geometry three points define a triangle, and in this triangle the length of each side is at most the sum of the lengths of the other two sides. This is called the "triangle axiom." The statement of this axiom does not involve the existence of the sides of the triangle as line segments, but depends only on the definition of distance between the points involved. If one chooses to regard closed curves as points and defines a distance between them as in the preceding paragraph, it can be shown that any three such curves satisfy the triangle axiom—that is, the three distances involved are related as are the three distances defined by an ordinary triangle. Working abstractly with this triangle axiom one can derive many properties of closed curves.

A modern approach to the mysterious problem of the existence of closed planetary orbits is to regard the closed curves involved as points p. Certain elementary physical conceptions then enable one to discover a function of these pseudo points with the property that the points (maximum, minimum, saddle, etc.), of this function occur only when p is a planetary orbit. This type of reduction of a problem in celestial mechanics to one in function theory belongs to a modern branch of mathematics—"the calculus of variations in the large." This theory shows that each topological kink in the space of the points p implies a planetary orbit. The extent and nature of the topological kinks is at present unknown but it is conjectured that these kinks are sufficiently numerous to explain the existence of the planets. This theory illustrates the possibilities of a suitable combination of topology and analysis.

If space permitted, one might go further and show how the classical notions of volume and area are replaced in modern analysis by a much more refined notion of measure, and how this measure theory contains a large part of probability theory and of dynamics. We should refer to the great technical advances of modern algebra and the ramifications of differential geometry. The examples which we have given are typical of modern mathematics in spirit rather than in extent. Unsolved problems are many and deep. Courage and imagination are needed to solve them. But mathematics belongs essentially to youth, and strong minds are ready to go ahead. We may explain and evaluate mathematics in many ways, yet the impulse to understand always remains and cannot be denied. Mathematics will advance regardless of its difficulties and, however great the advance, mathematicians will find still greater fields to conquer.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Discussion

ON CULTURAL CONTACT

To the Editor:

With reference to Mr. Hans Kohn's illuminating article, "Coalesce or Collide" (Summer, 1940), I should like to offer the following, less by way of criticism than of supplementation:

The primary reason why cultural contact has during the last century and a half "engendered and intensified conflict between nationalities" is *that the bearers or instruments of our modern* culture—the "liberal ideas" of the Enlightenment —have been converted, time and again and in countless ways, into instruments of power for the suppression and exploitation of peoples less "enlightened." Mr. Kohn is not insensible of this process: clearly his sympathies are not with Napoleon, but with the German and Italian nationalism which opposed him; not with German and British imperialism, but with the Slavs and Indians. But he thinks that these "derived nationalisms" have in general made the wrong reaction to cultural contact, having chosen not "the rational and liberal pattern of cooperation," but rather "the irrational pattern which . . . stresses isolationism and peculiarities . . ."

The attitude which Mr. Kohn here condemns as "irrational" has, however, a certain *rationale*. Briefly, it is this: The more "advanced" Western culture, with which contact is being sought, makes a great play of its "liberalism" and "democracy." At the same time it pursues the illiberal and undemocratic policy of imperialistic conquest and capitalistic exploitation. Therefore the pretensions of this culture are at variance with its acts: it is essentially hypocritical. And therefore we will have none of it—especially since our existence (as an independent nation) is threatened.

The whole thing is partly a defense-reaction (natural and inevitable, hence not so much "irrational" as non-rational) on the part of a more primitive people against the forces of capitalistic imperialism which threaten to engulf it. (As Mr. Lawrence Dennis has shown, easy imperialistic wars by the advanced against the backward constitute a necessary condition of capitalist democracy, and now that such easy wars are no longer to be had, this democracy is falling into irreparable decay.) At the same time, as I have tried to indicate, it is a piece of rather sophisticated and certainly realistic thinking. At its best it is also basically Christian, insofar as it recognizes imperialism, whenever and however it appears, to be a failing not of the British or French or Germans (who happen just now to be manifesting it), but a failing of human nature itself. The dialectic of history is that the noblest ideas (of democracy, toleration, self-determination of peoples etc.) are always set at naught by the inherent selfishness of man. The old Adam rises up to destroy the new Ideas. It is an error to think that they are destroyed by the stubbornness of subject peoples, "spell-bound by the past." The subject peoples merely recognize hypocrisy when they see it.

The paradox of liberalism is that its ideas are universally valid, but empirically inapplicable. To the Christian this is not a paradox at all: human nature being what it is, any idea that has universal validity *will be*—of strictest necessity—inapplicable to the actual world. It may be realized fragmentarily and temporarily; but it will always be overthrown—usually by the selfish and inconsistent actions of its own adherents—until the day when all humanity is redeemed. This view, to be sure, is not in accordance with "the rational and progressive liberalism of the 19th century" which Mr. Kohn values so highly; but it is in accordance with experience.

As for the emphasis on "peculiarity" and "uniqueness," this is part of the wisdom necessary for the *practical* application of any idea. As an example of the "middle way" of reacting to cultural contact, I am surprised that Mr. Kohn did not take Scandinavia. In discussing the political ideas of that extraordinary thinker, Søren Kierkegaard, Dr. Walter Lowrie says:

> "He was not opposed to change as such, but contended against the effort to impose upon Denmark the abstract ideas of the French Revolution, without taking into account the character of this northern race, the history of the nation, and the institutions which had grown up in conformity with the genius of his people. . . . The modern development of the Scandinavian nations, with the most liberal government in the world,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

but with institutions peculiar to themselves and appropriate to their situation, has amply justified S. K.'s position."

Of course there is "a common road for humanity"; the question is to what extent this "common road" can be crystallized into a political form or an economic system. Personally, I do not believe that the common road can be identified with any existing social institution. It cannot be identified with parliamentary democracy, but only wth "democracy" ideally conceived. What we are witnessing today is the disappearance of one set of social forms—the liberal-democratic-capitalistic set originating in the 18th century—and the emergence of an entirely different pattern. To the moralistic mind, the old order seems wholly good and the new order utterly diabolical; but this mind lacks historical perspective. Let us remember that Europe's finest intellects thought the French Revolution a piece of outrageous barbarism.

Considerations such as these tell against Mr. Kohn's conclusion, which is a value-judgment and hence philosophical. They in no way impair the subtlety of his historical analysis.

ROBERT W. BRETALL, *Evanston, Ill.*

MR. KOHN REFUTES A POINT

To the Editor:

A short article covering a vast problem is always subject to misunderstanding. Mr. Bretall misunderstood me, when he claims Scandinavia for the middle way. On the contrary, Scandinavia adopted completely the "liberal" outlook. Of course she kept and developed institutions peculiar to her, but so did England, France, the U. S., Holland. Everywhere the forms are most strikingly different, but the fundamental attitude is the same. It is the attitude developed by the 17th and 18th centuries in western Europe.

What we are witnessing today is not the "disappearance" (Mr. Bretall kindly discounts already all possibility of the resistance or survival of democracy and liberalism) "of one set of social forms," but the struggle against all the ideas and moral attitudes underlying the belief in the equality of men, in the dignity and liberty of the individual, in the common destiny of mankind. As I do not lack "historical perspective," no "old" order seems to me (or to any other living being) wholly good. The liberal as well as the Christian values represent an appeal to the best in man; they are regulative principles, never realized, often falsified, nevertheless ever present. The "new order" denies these values as regulative principles—it does not bring mainly new social forms, but a fundamental revaluation of all values. The French Revolution did not do that. Fascism is the great counterrevolution against all the values developed by Western mankind in the last centuries.

These brief remarks which touch only upon one point in Mr. Bretall's most interesting and illuminating remarks may be concluded by the suggestion that "liberal nationalism" was a progressive force in the world just on account of its "liberal" element, its belief in individual rights and its hope of a united peaceful world of equal nations, the hope of the 1848'ers everywhere. The "irrational" nationalism of the fascist type does not hold out a similar hope: the world which it foresees and which it wishes to build is an incessant conflict of great military empires. There may be need for new social forms—and in fact social forms are permanently changing everywhere—, there is no hope for mankind in the fascist fundamental attitude toward the values of life, of humanity and of the individual. The liberal imperialism of the English or Germans in the 19th century is fundamentally different from the fascist imperialism of the 20th century: the first was the result of the weakness and defection of men not living up to their own ideals: the second is the result of a proud application of the new "ideals"; the first could be criticized as a failure, the second was to be praised as a logical consummation.

HANS KOHN, *Northampton, Mass.*

A LETTER TO MR. KOHN

(*Editor's note:* The following letter is used with the author's and Mr. Kohn's permission.)

Mr. Hans Kohn, Northampton, Mass.
Dear Mr. Kohn:

It seems to me that there is a Byzantine current in Russian (not perhaps in Czech or even Polish) cultural nationalism; I am thinking primarily of Dostoievsky's branch of Christianity and the political ideas allied with his Christianity. Again, did not that current even pass over into the German 19th century cultural revival? The 19th century theological-philosophical-historical debate among German scholars reminds me much more of the Byzantine iconoclasts and other theologians and indeed of later Byzantine scholar-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ship than it does of anything that has happened in the West. And Berdyaev todays looks to me like a latter-day continuation of 19th century German-Russian thought, still sustaining certain currents which have gone out of it in his contemporaries.

I am not disagreeing with you in these suggestions; I think they fit into your thesis—somewhat as follows: that Russian nationalism, stirred by cultural contact with Germanism did, in some measure, dig up inspiration from its Byzantine past and incorporate it; that German nationalism, stirred by contact with French nationalism and ultimately reaching in the main *against* Western ideas, experienced also some impression from the nationalism of Russia, which was a response to contact with German nationalism; but German nationalism, *not fearing any superior culture in Slav peoples* as it feared the cultural superiority of the West, was ready to borrow ideas from the Russians in the very process of developing its cultural trend away from Western models.

RUSHTON COULBORN, *Atlanta, Ga.*

"THE AMA IS NOT A POLICEMAN"

To the Editor:

In a discussion of Mr. T. Swann Harding's "Farmers and Miners and Group-Health Plans" (Summer 1940) it is appropriate that I identify myself as one of "the rank and file of doctors" rather than of "those who direct" the American Medical Association and its branches. It is true that an oligarchy, or a minority, directs the AMA with the tacit consent of the "rank and file of doctors." So does a minority run Phi Beta Kappa, or the State of New York, or the CIO. Since there is no other comparable organization the views of the AMA, though those of a minority, are permitted to represent the views of the majority of physicians.

My first objection to a portion of this article and its logic is its view on what the role of the AMA really is. The AMA is not a policeman. It is not a "racket buster." It cannot make or enforce laws. This is a function of government. It is interested in maintaining as high an ethical standard among physicians as possible. On the whole I believe it has succeeded. . . . Hence Mr. Harding's instances would not deprecate the profession as a whole: "One such doctor received $2,400 a month and paid $1,200 to have his work done by others; . . . and these physicians were part of organized medicine." Yet in the next sentence he writes: "In other instances, the operating companies received the money, hired the doctors and nurses—and appropriated the difference—and made that difference as great as possible." In both instances, one has a good illustration of so-called "good business." With strong unionization now existing among miners it is definitely their own responsibility to determine that they receive their money's worth. This is not a function of the AMA. So at least on one unperturbed soul falls the lament: "Thus the miners paid a total of about $2,500,000 for shamefully inadequate hospitalization—and organized medicine made no protest." Nor did the miners.

As with the miners, the farmers do not present as much a problem of medical care as of economic maladjustment, of which the ability to purchase adequate medical treatment is but a small phase of the problem. This is admirably stated in the article under discussion as follows: "Today about 90% of the volume of agricultural products sent to market comes from one-half of the farms. This means that 50% of our farmers have only 10% of our gross agricultural income." This is the crux of the situation. Solve this problem and satisfactory medical attention will follow.

Naturally, farmers complain of the high cost of medicine and that "the doctor took too long to arrive." It has been my experience in nearly ten years of private practice that a patient may wait a month to call a doctor, but expects him within five minutes after he is called. If a doctor must travel 20 or 30 miles and waste 1½ to 2 hours on a single call, it is not unnatural that he seek commensurate remuneration to cover cost of expenses and time consumed. A patient of mine, to avoid the increased cost of having me call at her home, sought to lower expenses by coming to my office in a taxicab. This occurred only once. She stated that taxi drivers cost more than doctors. And yet, as an uncle of mine often remarked, a dollar fee *is* too high for a man with only a dime in his pocket—is too high for a large group of people in this country for whom adequate housing and nutrition also cost too much.

Unfortunately, the preceding discussion does not solve the immediate needs of the "medically neglected portion of our people." I believe this can be done rather simply by the government. Before turning to my solution, one should inquire into the reasons physicians do not particularly care for group-health plans—which apparently is the present government solution. Actually, Mr. Harding has stated the reason: "If there is enough money in the pool, all doctors are paid for all services monthly; if there is a surplus, it is carried over; *if there is a deficit, the doctors reduce their*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

charges proportionately" (italics mine). The doctor usually becomes the goat, particularly when actuarial statistics are yet to be established as proper bases for fees. Why should doctors be singled out to carry the economic burden for the adequate medical care of the poor? Why not the entire population? No other professional laboring group will do the same. As long as those "ifs" exist in group-health contracts, the doctor must gamble on an elastic compensation, and group-health plans will not entice the best of the medical fraternity.

Medical inadequacies exist and can be elicited by government surveys and inspections. This is a function of the state and not the AMA. The state can be an impartial investigator. The AMA cannot because it represents one side.

Subsidies to doctors to induce them to practice among poor, medically neglected people constitute, in my opinion, the simplest and easiest answer to the problem in our present state. If subsidies are given to encourage infant industries or establish postal mail routes as with the airlines and ship companies, why could not a relatively small bonus, ranging from $1,000 to $2,000 be paid annually to physicians for their services in poor communities? Any additional amounts collected by the doctor would enhance his income. As there would be free choice of physician, competition would force a high standard of practice. If a doctor's income were to exceed, say, $5,000 annually the government subsidy could be reduced in that year. By thus guaranteeing a minimum income the government could induce plenty of well-trained younger physicians to seek country practices rather than "naturally tend to congregate in cities where they can find the medical equipment" (and financial security) "essential to good medical practice." Eventually, these subsidies could be replaced by adequate and certain financial compensation from group-health plans, with the government acting as guarantor of minimum annual fees for participating physicians.

The matter of hospitalization will be solved shortly by the recent congressional action in authorizing (with the consent of the AMA as to need) the construction of small hospitals at government expense.

Thus, the remedy for the "medically neglected portion of our people" is possible immediately and at comparatively little cost. If farmers received in 1939 $506,179,199 for *not* producing crops, why not use a small fraction of this total, say about $10,000,000, and have five to ten thousand contented doctors giving adequate medical service to the medically indigent of the country?

FRANK A. MARSHALL, M.D., *Weehawken, N. J.*

—But "It Does Set Itself Up As One"

To the Editor:

I cite in response to Dr. Marshall's intelligent comment the fact that while the AMA prides itself on correcting abuses, here are abuses it has not sought to correct; while it credits itself with giving us such a high standard of medical service that no improvement is needed from governmental sources, here are fields in which improvement is needed and in one of which the government has done what the AMA neglected.

While the AMA may not be a policeman it does set itself up as one. Dr. Marshall is apparently unfamiliar with the claims Dr. Morris Fishbein and others make. I did not seek to accuse the entire profession; I said, "This is going on and the AMA makes no effective effort to stop it."

When he says the miners are at fault, Dr. Marshall simply echoes what Walter M. Polakov of the United Mine Workers Association, to whom the study was reported, told me personally.

The alibi of economic maladjustment does not extend as far as Dr. Marshall thinks, however. The government took these farm people within the frame of reference of economic maladjustment and yet evolved a system whereby people who had never paid for medical care before were enabled to pay 100% for hospital care and 80% for doctor care, whereas the average doctor in this country collects only 60% of his billings. Dr. Marshall is right: we should no more expect a doctor to give free service than we do a garage repair man, and I have been saying this in print for 15 years. My plea has been for schemes which give people care at regular rates which they can pay and which in turn pay the doctors.

I certainly agree with him that some sort of subsidy must be given doctors to treat those without income and at very low income levels.

T. SWANN HARDING, *Falls Church, Va.*

THE PAMPHLETEER MONTHLY

A guide to over 300 new pamphlets each month. Includes professional papers, Ph.D. theses, university publications. Subscriber's 10% discount on pamphlet orders. Sample copy, send 20c.; 3 month trial, 50c. Pamphlet Distributing Co., Dept. BT, Box 8, Times Square Station, New York, N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

About Our Authors

Quotation marks usually indicate passages taken directly from autobiographical letters requested from the authors themselves.

We shall not take this occasion to try to brief JOHN ERSKINE'S multifarious interests or his honorary degrees or his musical responsibilities (which have included the directorship of the Juilliard School of Music and of the Metropolitan Opera Association). We remind readers, rather, that for 19 years he was professor of English at Columbia, and that he has written books not only for the diversion of the popular reader but for the serious study of scholars. . . . He is one of the men who have made THE AMERICAN SCHOLAR possible; for he stood behind the idea before it was translated into concrete form —as he has for the past nine years given constantly of his time to make that form good.

ERICH KAHLER was born in Prague. Subsequently he lived in Vienna, Germany, Italy, England and Switzerland. He came to the United States in 1938. . . . It is a pity there is room here for only a selective quotation from a recent letter from him. "In a book, *Der Beruf der Wissenschaft*, published in 1919, I tried to awaken scholars and intelligentsia to a sense of their responsibility for guiding humanity and to the intuitive sense of life which humanity lost when it lost an effective belief in the authority of religious dogma and the reality of a personal creator. . . . I am convinced that today and tomorrow all intellectual forces will be needed and should be used toward one end—the making of America, this last stronghold of human sentiment, mentally safe for the huge task of creating a new world order. It is a race between the rapid and contagious spread of anarchy on the one hand, and on the other the concentrated thought and education essential if this new order is to be envisioned and implanted in the faith of the people."

JOHN R. FLEMING asks us to record that "in all probability I got into the Department of Agriculture because as a boy I spent my summers on a farm in Pennsylvania where I rejoiced in the wisdom of a gentle farmer uncle and the pleasant ways of farm life before the first World War. . . . I went to Cornell for an agricultural course, which I combined with summer work as hired man on farms in New York and Kansas. Then somehow the virus of journalism got me. After college came a turn with the *Springfield Union* in various capacities. I then went to Ohio State University to work with Russell Lord and J. E. McClintock in running an agricultural news service and teaching county agricultural agents the elements of newswriting. That was followed by a period in the Department of Agriculture as 'special agricultural writer.' I am now combining writing with administrative work in the Bureau of Agricultural Economics."

HORACE L. FRIESS is associate professor of philosophy at Columbia and associate editor of *The Review of Religion*. "I have become especially interested in studying the dynamics of groups and the role of religion and philosophy in relation thereto. Born in 1900, I am a little surprised at the turn the century has now reached. Growth in the responsibility of groups toward each other would seem to be the condition of further progress, not to mention of continued existence."

For the past ten years ERNEST J. SIMMONS has taught English and Russian literature at Harvard. His *Dostoevski: The Making of a Novelist*, off the press soon, is the latest in the long line of his articles and novels. . . . "I feel very strongly about the subject and practice of democracy, in the country at large and in our educational institutions in particular. Democracy, like charity, should begin at home. Those who teach the youth of this nation cannot be expected to inculcate their charges with the true spirit of democracy so long as they themselves are not accorded some measure of democratic control over the educational system under which they work."

Several years ago GEORGE BOAS said that among his pet aversions he included scholars and able executives. That ought to give this author of ten or a dozen books, contributor on former occasions (Vol. 5, No. 4; Vol. 7, No. 3) to THE AMERICAN SCHOLAR and professor of the history of philosophy at Johns Hopkins an impartial attitude toward academic freedom and tenure.

CHARLES WESLEY FLINT'S 20 years in college administration (seven as president of Cornell College and 14 as chancellor of Syracuse University) have been followed by four years as Bishop in the Methodist Church. "Whether these years of detachment disqualify me or permit a better perspective I do not know." The editors have had no cause to regret their invitation.

JULIUS SEELYE BIXLER, Bussey Professor of Theology at the Harvard Divinity School since 1933, says, "in these terrible days all we can do is to try to see the truth as fairly as possible." He has a mind fitted by training and habit

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to fair appraisal; and the time he spent in Germany (1928-29) gave him a direct understanding of that nation—seen against a background of the international world he refers to in the course of his discussion. He began his academic career at American College, Madura, India; was then director of religious activities at Amherst College; in 1920-22 was back in the Orient, as lecturer in philosophy at American University, Beirut, Syria; and spent the years 1924-33 at Smith College. . . . He has written several books and numerous articles, including four in THE AMERICAN SCHOLAR (Vol. 1, No. 1; Vol. 1, No. 4; Vol. 4, No. 4; Vol. 8, No. 3).

ALLEN TATE comments that apart from his work he is a fiction. That still leaves a most substantial person. He was a Guggenheim Fellow from 1928 to 1930, has been a resident fellow in writing, creative arts experiment, at Princeton University since 1939; is an advisory editor to the *Kenyon Review*; and has contributed to many periodicals. There may or may not be a connection between his immersion in work and his versatility in writing media. At any rate his long list of books includes *Reactionary Essays*, several volumes of poetry, *The Critique of Humanism* (in collaboration with others), full-length studies of such southern figures as Stonewall Jackson, Jefferson Davis and Robert E. Lee, and a share in *I'll Take My Stand—The South and the Agrarian Tradition.*

ALBERT GUÉRARD, careful and prolific author, and professor of general literature at Stanford University since 1925, was born in France, received his B.A. from the University of Paris, did post-graduate work in London and at the Sorbonne, and came to this country in 1906. . . . "Education in historical cities gave me a great love of the past—old things, old books, mellow culture, ancient institutions. But life under three flags taught me that no tradition contains exclusive and absolute truth. All that we call 'historical' is but a garment. Life is ever new. . . . My bête noire is Napoleonism. It is an insult to thought to believe that all things national or international can be settled by a whiff of grapeshot. There will be Hitlers so long as there are Napoleon-worshipers; and no peace until we overcome the delusion of victory."

To KATHARINE KELLOCK, at first editor of the "tour end" of the Federal Writers Project's state guide books and now editor of the encyclopedia series, belongs much credit for both the inception and continuation of the guides. Her professional life began, however, as a nurse doing relief work in Eastern Europe. "For three years I supervised feeding, set up orphanages, distributed clothes, sold horses. Back in America I did public health nursing while attending Columbia, where I started work in science and the social sciences but eventually switched to journalism. Interest in public health survived to give me six months at one of the pueblos of the Southwest and education in the horrors of the old Indian Service, then manned by politicians. For the most part the years before the establishment of the Project were spent in doing research in American history, biographies for the *Dictionary of American Biography* and feature stories on Washington."

KURT PINTHUS has recently been made a member of the International Institute of Social Research at Columbia University and has begun the preparation of a comprehensive volume on literature, the theater and motion pictures in the Germany of the years 1908-33, a subject on which he speaks authoritatively and exuberantly out of years of firsthand knowledge. . . . In his university days he was leading member of a group of young writers. Out of this nucleus developed the German expressionist movement and two publishing houses, outstanding for their lists of contemporary authors, whom he served as literary adviser. In 1913, when to take the film seriously was to be ridiculed, he wrote the world's first critical book-length study of the motion picture. (He was afterwards closely associated with such men as Emil Jannings, Fritz Lang, William Dieterle.) He founded *Genius*, the German expressionist movement's periodical; became a member of the editorial board of *8-Uhr-Abendblatt* and of *Das Tagebuch*; lectured at Lessing University in Berlin; was the first person to introduce discussions of literary matters over the German radio. . . . He was able to bring an extraordinary treasure to this country—a 7000-volume library of contemporary German literature, much of which can no longer be found in Nazi Germany.

MARSTON MORSE, professor of mathematics at Harvard, 1932-1935, and since 1935 professor of mathematics at the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton, is the author of two books on mathematics published respectively at the request of the American Mathematical Society and the Academy of Science of Paris; and is largely responsible for one of the currently accepted theories in mathematics, "the calculus of variations in the large," on which he has lectured at the Sorbonne and other mathematical centers in Europe.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Index to Volume 9

Names of authors in *italics*; main articles in **bold face**
The pagination of the volume is divided as follows: Winter, 1–128; Spring, 129–256; Summer, 257–384; Autumn, 385–512
Indexed in the *Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature*

About Our Authors, 124, 252, 382, 509
Academic Question? Tenure: A Symposium, *Horace L. Friess, Ernest J. Simmons, George Boas, Charles W. Flint*, 417
Academic Tenure, *Henry M. Wriston*, 339
Adams, Brooks, Caustic Cassandra, *Charles A. Madison*, 214
AMA Is Not a Policeman, The, *Frank A. Marshall, M.D.*, 507
America, Social and Political Democracy in, *Gilberto Freyre*, 228
And Jacques Barzun Retorts, *Jacques Barzun*, 381
Architecture Abroad, Recent, *Douglas Haskell*, 372
Artists, How to Fit Universities for, *Stephen C. Pepper*, 192
Art under Five Years of Federal Patronage, *George Biddle*, 327
Ascoli, Max, 97
Astronomy, Recent Highlights in, *Newton Lacy Pierce*, 111
Background for Hitler in German Thought, The, *Julius S. Bixler*, 437
Barzun, Jacques, 147, 381
Beckett, Grace, 379
Belief in the Common Man, *Carl J. Friedrich*, 350
Biddle, George, 327
Bixler, Julius Seelye, 437
Boas, George, 429
Books, The Use and Abuse of, *Stith Thompson*, 85
Borgese, G. A., 31
Bretall, Robert W., 505
Brinton, Crane, Editorial, 259
Britt, Steuart Henderson, 201
Brooks Adams, Caustic Cassandra, *Charles A. Madison*, 214
Brown, Harold Chapman, 164
But "It Does Set Itself up as One," *T. Swann Harding*, 508
Can the English See a Joke? *Max Eastman*, 274
Can There Be a Philosophy of History? *Maurice Mandelbaum*, 74
Coalesce or Collide, *Hans Kohn*, 261
Confessions of an Unrepentant Wilsonian, *Albert Guérard*, 461
Corwin, Edward S., 159
Coulborn, Rushton, 506
Crisis in the Dance, A, *John Martin*, 116
Culture Inside Nazi Germany, *Kurt Pinthus*, 483
Dance, A Crisis in the, *John Martin*, 116
Democracy in America, Social and Political, *Gilberto Freyre*, 228
Democracy in England, *Winchester H. Heicher*, 122
Democracy Was Young, When, *George P. Schmidt*, 316
Deutsch, Babette, 19
Dilemma of the Present-Day Moralist, The, *Harold Chapman Brown*, 164
Eastman, Max, 274
Editorials: *William A. Neilson*, 3; *Irwin Edman*, 131; *Crane Brinton*, 259; *John Erskine*, 387
Edman, Irwin, Editorial, 131
Eliot, T. S., and the Laodiceans, *Babette Deutsch*, 19
English See a Joke? Can the, *Max Eastman*, 274
Erskine, John, Editorial, 387
Farmer, Uncle Sam—, *John R. Fleming*, 402
Farmers and Miners and Group-Health Plans, *T. Swann Harding*, 305
Federal Patronage, Art under Five Years of, *George Biddle*, 327
Feiler, Arthur, 133
Fisher, Dorothy Canfield, 121
Fleming, John R., 402
Flint, Charles W., 433
Forgotten Hour, *poem, Humbert Wolfe*, 164
Free Speech and Liberal Speeches, *Herbert W. Schneider*, 378
Freedom of Speech, *Max Ascoli*, 97
Freedom, On Intellectual, *Dale Kramer*, 250
Freedom, The Paradox of Intellectual, *John Herman Randall, Jr.*, 5
Freyre, Gilberto, 228
Friedrich, Carl J., 350
Friess, Horace L., 420
German Thought, The Background for Hitler in, *Julius S. Bixler*, 437
Germany, Culture Inside Nazi, *Kurt Pinthus*, 483
Gross, Mason W., 361
Group-Health Plans, Farmers and Miners and, *T. Swann Harding*, 305
Guérard, Albert, 461
Habein, Harold C., M.D., 237
Harding, T. Swann, 305, 508
Haskell, Douglas, 372
Heicher, Winchester H., 122
History? Can There Be a Philosophy of, *Maurice Mandelbaum*, 74

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

How to Fit Universities for Artists, *Stephen C Pepper*, 192
In Search of Scientific Method, *Howard D. Roelofs*, 296
Intellectual Freedom, On, *Dale Kramer*, 250
Intellectual Freedom, The Paradox of, *John Herman Randall, Jr.*, 5
Is "American Balkanization" Unavoidable? *Fritz Karl Mann*, 52
Jacob at the Ford in Vermont, *Dorothy Canfield Fisher*, 121
Kahler, Erich, 389
Kellock, Katharine, 473
Kohn, A Letter to Mr., *Rushton Coulborn*, 506
Kohn, Hans, 261, 506
Kramer, Dale, 250
Law, Time Lag in the, *Steuart Henderson Britt*, 201
Madison, Charles, 121, 214
Man, Belief in the Common, *Carl J. Friedrich*, 350
Mandelbaum, Maurice, 74
Mann, Fritz Karl, 52
Marshall, Frank A., M.D., 507
Martin, John, 116
Mathematics, Twentieth Century, *Marston Morse*, 499
Medicine, Some Recent Advances in, *Harold C. Habein, M.D.*, 237
Men Reading, New York Public Library, *poem, John Chamberlain*, 51
Microscopes, Telescopes and, *W. V. Houston*, 63
Miners and Group-Health Plans, Farmers and, *T. Swann Harding*, 305
Miss Emily and the Bibliographer, *Allen Tate*, 449
Monroe Doctrine in Our Own Times, The, *William Spence Robertson*, 284
Moralist, The Dilemma of the Present-Day, *Harold Chapman Brown*, 164
Morse, Marston, 499
More Important than Daily Bread, *Erich Kahler*, 389
Mr. Kohn Refutes a Point, *Hans Kohn*, 506
Mr. Madison Cites Reality, *Charles Madison*, 121
Neilson, William A., Editorial, 3
On Cultural Contact, *Robert W. Bretall*, 505
On Intellectual Freedom, *Dale Kramer*, 250
Paradox of Intellectual Freedom, The, *John Herman Randall, Jr.*, 5
Pepper, Stephen C., 192
Philosophy of Adventure, Whitehead's, *Mason W. Gross*, 361
Philosophy of History? Can There Be a, *Maurice Mandelbaum*, 74
Pierce, Newton Lacy, 111
Pinthus, Kurt, 483
Poems: Men Reading, New York Public Library, *John Chamberlain*, 51; Forgotten Hour, *Humbert Wolfe*, 175
Political Creeds and Machiavellian Heresy, *G. A. Borgese*, 31
Political Democracy in America, Social and, *Gilberto Freyre*, 228
Randall, John Herman, Jr., 5
Reader Challenges THE SCHOLAR, A, *Anne N. Timmerman*, 250
Reader Concentrates on Romanticism, A, *Allen Porterfield*, 380
Recent Architecture Abroad, *Douglas Haskell*, 372
Recent Highlights in Astronomy, *Newton Lacy Pierce*, 111
Recent Strangers Within Our Gates, *Gerhart Saenger*, 180
Robertson, William Spence, 284
Roelofs, Howard D., 296
Romanticism, A Reader Concentrates on, *Allen Porterfield*, 380
Romanticism, To the Rescue of, *Jacques Barzun*, 147
Saenger, Gerhart, 180
Schmidt, George P., 316
Schneider, Herbert W., 378
Simmons, Ernest J., 424
Social and Political Democracy in America, *Gilberto Freyre*, 228
Some Recent Advances in Medicine, *Harold C. Habein, M.D.*, 237
Statesmanship on the Supreme Court, *Edward S. Corwin*, 159
Tate, Allen, 449
Telescopes and Microscopes, *W. V. Houston*, 63
Tenure, Academic, *Henry M. Wriston*, 339
Tenure: Academic Question? A Symposium, *Horace L. Friess, Ernest J. Simmons, George Boas, Charles W. Flint*, 417
Thompson, Stith, 85
Time Lag in the Law, *Steuart Henderson Britt*, 201
Timmerman, Anne N., 250
To the Rescue of Romanticism, *Jacques Barzun*, 147
Trade Agreements Act, The, *Arthur Feiler*, 133
Trade Agreements, On, *Grace Beckett*, 379
T. S. Eliot and the Laodiceans, *Babette Deutsch*, 19
Twentieth Century Mathematics, *Marston Morse*, 499
Uncle Sam—Farmer, *John R. Fleming*, 402
Universities for Artists, How to Fit, *Stephen C. Pepper*, 192
Use and Abuse of Books, The, *Stith Thompson*, 85
Wilsonian, Confessions of an Unrepentant, *Albert Guérard*, 461
When Democracy was Young, *George P. Schmidt*, 316
Whitehead's Philosophy of Adventure, *Mason W. Gross*, 361
Wolfe, Humbert, 175
WPA Writers: Portraitists of the United States, The, *Katharine Kellock*, 473
Wriston, Henry M., 339

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TWICE A YEAR

A BOOK of LITERATURE, THE ARTS AND CIVIL LIBERTIES

DOUBLE NUMBER V-VI *Ready:* NOVEMBER, 1940

$2.00. Clothbound: $2.75. Illustrated. 500 Pages.

WAR: MAX ASCOLI; MAX LERNER; POETRY SECTION (Young Poets)

WILLIAM SAROYAN: THREE BALLETS

ALFRED STIEGLITZ · LOUIS SULLIVAN · G. A. BORGESE · VICO

RANDOLPH BOURNE: Early Letters and Diary

MUSIC SECTION: ROY HARRIS, AARON COPLAND, ERNEST BLOCH, PAUL ROSENFELD, WILLIAM SCHUMAN, CHARLES IVES. . . .

RAINER MARIA RILKE Section · LORCA · DESANCTIS

STORIES by PEREDA · GRAF · W. C. WILLIAMS · NIN

PAINTING SECTION: ELIE FAURE, ANGNA ENTERS, etc.

REVALUATION SECTION: HENRY MILLER on Balzac; OLSON on Dostoevsky; BOVEY on Mann; PEGGRAM on Gide

MARGARET SANGER: The Story of BIRTH CONTROL

CIVIL LIBERTIES SECTION: Supreme Court Decisions (1939-40); Cases Pending; Civil Liberties in India; in Russia, etc.; BERTRAND RUSSELL Case, etc.

On Sale at all Bookstores or

Twice a Year Press: 509 Madison Avenue, N. Y. C.

Also Published by Twice a Year Press: LOVE POSSESSED JUANA, a Play of Inquisition Spain by ANGNA ENTERS ($2.50)

Ready: December, 1940: A FRANZ KAFKA Miscellany ($2.00) (Clothbound)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IN addition to the capable production of novels and other literary works in large editions for publishers, we are prepared to design and execute in an individual manner: Genealogies, Catalogues of Collections, and other privately printed Books.

The Haddon Craftsmen
Camden, New Jersey

New York Office: 393 Seventh Avenue

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED